A Study of Tamil Verbs

Dr. V. Sp. MANICKAM

ALAI UNIVERSITY

E12331
R012A03

A Study of Tamil Verbs

Dr. V. Sp. MANICKAM, M.A., M.O.L., Ph.D.
Professor and Head of the Department of Tamil
Annamalai University

ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY
ANNAMALAINAGAR
1972

First Edition : October 1972
Annamalai University Publication
Published under U. G. C. Grant

Rs. 5-00
U. S. A.
$ 2-00

Printed at
Sivakami Printers, Annamalainagar

FOREWORD

It is with great pleasure I have gone through the monograph "A Study of Tamil Verbs" by Professor V. Sp. Manickam and I must say that this is a worthy book from a worthy scholar. Dr. V. Sp. Manickam is one of the few scholars who is well-versed both in Tamil literature and grammar and from whom one can legitimately expect scholarly works on literature as well as on grammar.

"A Study of Tamil Verbs" is a good contribution towards the study of Tamil grammatical theories and the author has succeeded in his attempt to bring forth various problems with regard to Tamil Verbs. In the course of the discussion he has raised many controversial issues and has convincingly argued to establish his view points with lucid explanations and lively arguments coupled with illuminating interpretations and linguistic insights.

To mention one or two, the author has dealt with in detail the place of 'Uriccol' in Tamil grammar and asserts that 'Uriccol' does not denote the verbal roots which is quite contrary to the opinions of many renowned traditional grammarians. Quoting profusely from various grammars in Tamil, the author is able to establish that "Uriccol is not the basic part of noun or verb but the defective nature of it." In the course of the arguments the author has clearly shown the fallacy found in the established view and has brought out the contradictions that one can find in the statements of even one and the same scholar. It is also very gratifying to note the expla-

nation of the author that the word Uriccol can be connected with the word *Urimai* 'right' which does not mean independence and therefore these words may be considered as words in their own right but not as independent words.

The treatment of tanvinai and piravinai is also very illuminating. The author has rightly pointed out that "English terms Intransitive, Transitive, and Causative will in no way be appropriate to denote the classification which divides the entire Tamil verbs into two classes, namely tanvinai and piravinai." Mention has to be made that though most of the tanvinai and piravinai verbs can be brought under intransitive and transitive verbs the concept behind the Tamil terminology is not found in the English terms. It is worth noticing that the author has come to the conclusion that piravinai verb has two subjects -which is a well established fact in modern linguistics-though in surface level the subject of the root (as the author puts it) is transformed into the object of the sentences. The discussions on 'Tenses' and 'Changes of meaning' are some of the inspiring sections of the book and the mastery of the author over the subject can be felt throughout.

The author has to be admired for the wonderful way in which he had dealt with various grammatical problems and I must say that the book 'A Study of Tamil verbs' is one of the valuable additions to the study of the grammatical tradition of the Tamil language.

S. Agesthialingom
Director
Centre of Advanced Study in Linguistics
Annamalai University

PREFACE

It really gives me immense pleasure to publish after a long spell of twenty four years, my research thesis "Tamil Verbs" approved by the University of Madras for the award of M. O. L. Degree in 1948. I am aware that most of the philological terms used in this thesis are not now in vogue and that new linguistic terms have replaced them. Notwithstanding the change of terminology, I do hope that the collection of material bearing on the several aspects of verbs in Tamil and the conclusions based on them are still valid in the field of linguistics. This prompted me to make this thesis available to researchers in print.

I feel honoured by the favour shown to me by the Vice-Chancellor and members of the Syndicate of the Annamalai University for sanctioning publication of this book in the University series. I am very grateful to them for their kindness.

It is my duty to record my sincere obligation to the late Dr. A. Chidambaranathan Chettiar, former Professor of Tamil in this University for his fruitful guidance in this research work of mine.

I wish to express my thanks to Dr. S. Agesthialingom, Director of the Centre of Advanced Study in Linguistics, Annamalai University for his valuable Foreword. My thanks are due to Dr. S. V. Shanmugam, Reader in Linguistics for going through the thesis before publication and for his useful suggestions and to Thiru K. Narayanan, M. A., Lecturer in Tamil for preparing Index.

Annamalainagar
12-10-72

V. Sp. Manickam

NEW FINDINGS

1. The ancient Tamil grammarians have recognised only Noun and Verb as parts of speech.

2. *uriccol*, on the face of its meaning, is bound to belong either to noun or verb.

3. *Kuṟaiccoṟkiḷavi* reveals that *uriccol* has some defect in its nature or application, not in form or in meaning.

4. The unique nature of the verb is to possess only the capacity to indicate time, not to include in itself the tense-sign, as against the view of Iḷampūraṇar and Cēṉāvaraiyar.

5. Tolkāppiyar has knowledge of the existence of the common roots.

6. To denote a secondary meaning without any mark of derivation is one of the peculiarities of the Tamil verbs, as against the view of the later grammarians.

7. The suttiram "Viḷampiya pakuti" etc., of Naṉṉūl (S. 139) is formulated by the author to indicate the change which the verbal roots undergo, as against the view of Caṅkara-namacivāyar and Civagnāṉamuṉivar.

8. The verbal root almost remains unchanged.

9. *āku* and *pōku*, *varu* and *taru* and *nō* should be the original roots.

10. The first member constituting the compound of 'Viṉaittokai' is the best means to ascertain the roots of any doubtful verbs.

11. *pōku* an uriccol has superseded '*cel*', a viṉaiccol, after the days of the Sangam Classics.

12. The wording of Tol. 934 lends itself to two meanings covering both the loss of old words and the appearance of new ones.

13. The roots *ce, civaṉ, āṉ, nūḷ, eṉ, coli, ey* and *paḻiccu* fell into desuetude.

14. The new words beginning with '*ca*' have originated from the old materials.

15. *iṟa, cūḻ* and *tūṅku* changed their meanings after the period of the Sangam literature.

16. Taṉviṉai consists of the verbs of ceyappaṭu poruḷkuṉṟiya viṉai and of the verbs of the first subdivision of ceyap paṭu poruḷ kuṉṟā viṉai.

17. Piṟaviṉai consists of the verbs of the second subdivision of ceyappaṭu poruḷ kuṉṟā viṉai.

18. The peculiar combination of '*ī*' with a verbal noun is specially constructed to change the rest of the verbs to which the regular modes are inapplicable, into piṟaviṉai.

19. *vi* and *pi* the so-called causative particles are the combinations of the 'v' and 'p' the final parts of the verbal nouns with 'i' the shortened form of an auxiliary verb.

20. The adding of 'i' to the verbal noun to form piṟaviṉai is not an innovation which is found even in Tolkāppiyam.

21. The long '*ī*' in *ceṉṟī* is a taṉviṉai verb, not an expletive, as against the view of all the later grammarians and the commentators.

22. The construction and meaning of *ceṉṟī* and *ceyvi* are remarkable.

23. The author of Naṉṉūl seems to be at fault when he has included in his composition the suttiram '*muṉṉilai muṉṉar*' (933 of Tol.) separating it from its preceding suttiram '*ceyyāy eṉṉum*' (932 of Tol.)

24. Tolkāppiyar has knowledge of the existence of tense-signs.

25. The reference with no particular time will not preclude '*kuṟippu*' from holding '*viṉai*'.

26. Notwithstanding the characteristic of the verbal root to possess the capacity to express time, the Future is implicit in the root.

27. The verbal root will denote the imperative singular of the second person, requiring no sign for that purpose, as against the statement of the commentators.

28. Tolkāppiyar has clearly stated that only the past and the present tenses are understood in the compound of 'Viṉait-tokai', as against the theory of the later grammarians.

29. '*aṉ*' in *naṭappaṉa* and 'v' in *nāṭuvāṉ*' should be regarded as the particles of differentiation.

30. The future tense of the third person neuter singular, like all other persons, was also regularly formed by the addition of the suffix 'atu' to the verbal noun, as against the statement of Dr. Caldwell.

31. The combination of the person-signs with the verbal nouns or with the verbal themes, with the minor changes as euphony requires, contributes to the expression of the idea of the Future requiring no sign for that purpose.

32. The long vowel ā the sign of negation is nothing but the detached portion of the suffixes of the third person.

33. The direct combination of the signs of personality with the verbal roots alone tends to the expression of the idea of negation.

34. The addition of '*ta*' to the negative relative participle is of later development.

35. Tamil like Malayalam, possesses the three tenses in the negation, as against the view of Dr. Caldwell.

36. Before the advent of *āniṉṟu, kiṉṟu* and *kiṟu, utu* and *um* were used by the ancient people to denote the present time through all persons.

37. The usual interpretation and explanation to the suttirams 512, 553, 682, 897, 932, 933 and 934 of Tolkāppiyam are not correct.

38. What characterises the Medieval History of the Tamil Language is the tendency towards simplifying and systematising the grammatical forms through the force of analogy.

TRANSLITERATION

Vowels

a	–	அ
ā	–	ஆ
i	–	இ
ī	–	ஈ
u	–	உ
ū	–	ஊ
e	–	எ
ē	–	ஏ
ai	–	ஐ
o	–	ஒ
ō	–	ஓ
au	–	ஔ
h	–	ஃ

Consonants

k	–	க
ṅ	–	ங
c	–	ச
n̄	–	ஞ
ṭ	–	ட
ṇ	–	ண
t	–	த
n	–	ந
p	–	ப
m	–	ம
y	–	ய
r	–	ர
l	–	ல
v	–	வ
ḻ	–	ழ
ḷ	–	ள
ṟ	–	ற
ṉ	–	ன

CONTENTS

			Page
	Foreword	...	i
	Preface	...	iv
	New Findings	...	v
	Transliteration	...	ix
1.	The Verbal Form	...	1
2.	The Nature of Verbal roots	...	10
3.	Changes in the Verbal roots	...	23
4.	Some Verbal roots-an examination	...	35
5.	The loss of old Verbal roots	...	48
6.	The rise of new Verbal roots	...	64
7.	Changes of meaning	...	72
8.	Taṉviṉai and Piṟaviṉai	...	77
9.	ī(ஈ)-a Taṉviṉai verb	...	89
10.	General remarks on Tenses	...	92
11.	The Future implicit in the root	...	96
12.	The formation of the Future	...	103
13.	The Negative verb	...	109
14.	The present tense-infixes of the Sangam period	...	122
15.	Conclusion	...	128
16.	Bibliography	...	131
17.	Index	...	133

I. THE VERBAL FORM

It will be my endeavour in this Chapter to investigate the views put forth by the Tamil grammarians with regard to the Verbal Form and to ascertain the true nature of that form as distinct from those of Peyarccol, Iṭaiccol and Uriccol, - together with the origin and meaning of 'Viṉai', the Tamil denomination for verb.

Tolkāppiyar's View :

Ancient Tamil grammarians have regarded only Noun and Verb as the two component parts of speech in Tamil. They do not at all recognise 'Iṭaiccol' and 'Uriccol' as parts of speech. It seems to me that they logically opposed such a recognition on the ground that 'Iṭaiccol' and 'Uriccol' are not independent categories and they are the dependants of noun and verb for their expression. This statement is amply borne out when we analyse the two suttirams :

"*col eṉap paṭupa peyarē viṉai eṉṟu*
āyiraṇṭu eṉpa aṟintici nōrē." (Tol. 642)

(The learned say that words are of two kinds - noun and verb)

"*iṭaiccol kiḷaviyum uriccol kiḷaviyum*
avaṟṟuvaḻi maruṅkiṉ tōṉṟum eṉpa." (Tol. 643)

(They also say that itaiccol and uriccol will express themselves after them - noun and verb)

The composition of two different suttirams - one for noun and verb and the other for 'iṭaiccol' and 'uriccol', the clear emphasis 'colleṉap paṭupa ...... āyiraṇṭu eṉpa', the unwillingness to mention that Tamil has four parts of speech even after the enumeration of 'iṭaiccol' and 'uriccol', and the meaning of the very words 'iṭaiccol' and 'uriccol', all go to justify the primary and independent status of Peyar and Viṉai, and the secondary and dependent status of Iṭaiccol and Uriccol.

There is a close analogy in Tolkappiyar's approach to the statement regarding the primary sounds and the primary words:

"*eḻuttu eṉappaṭupa,*
akara mutal,
ṉakara iṟuvāi muppahtu eṉpa" (Tol. 1)

(Sounds are thirty from a to ṉ)

"*col eṉappaṭupa .. āyiraṇṭu eṉpa*" (Tol. 642

Here the emphasis is upon Peyar and Viṉai, similar to the emphasis upon the thirty sounds. Likewise a similar analogy is perceived in his approach to the statement regarding the secondary sounds and the secondary words:

'*cārntu varal marapiṉ mūṉṟu alaṅkaṭaiyē*' (Tol. 1)
(excluding three dependent sounds)

"*iṭaiccol kiḷaviyum uriccol kiḷaviyum*
avaṟṟuvaḻi maruṅkiṉ tōṉṟum eṉpa" (Tol. 643)

It is clear therefore that Tolkāppiyar and his predecessors recognised that Peyar and Viṉai are the only two parts of speech which enjoy an independent status. In this connection, Vendryes' view also seems to support the position taken by Tolkāppiyar; for he says, "pursuing the process of elimination, we end by leaving intact only two parts of speech, the noun

and the verb. The other parts of speech all fall within these two fundamental classes." [1]

The views of the later Grammarians :

Civagnāṉa Muṉivar is of opinion in his 'Sūttiravirutti' that all the verbal roots such as naṭa, vā. etc. are naturally uriccol and that they become verbs only when they are employed to denote action. His explanation is that as uriccol deals with the two kinds of qualities, i. e., abstract qualities and qualities of action, the verbal stems like naṭa, vā, etc., when they do not denote actual happening (puṭai peyarcci), should be held as the qualities of action.[2] The same scholar, contrary to his above view, seems tō have stated in his commentary of S. 137 of Naṉṉūl that all the verbal forms are to be regarded as nouns (taṉi viṉaippeyar).

Subramaniya Dikshitar, the author of Pirayōka vivēkam, misunderstanding some of the suttirams in Tolkāppiyam, has advocated a new theory that there is only one part of speech in Tamil and that too uriccol.[3] Teyvaccilaiyār, one of the commentators of Tolkāppiyar's Collatikāram, has remarked that what is expressed by uriccol in Tamil, is identical with that denoted by 'dhātu' in Sanskrit,[4] thereby suggesting that all the roots, whether nominal or verbal, belong to uriccol. He quotes as a proof of his point the expression 'kuṟaiccoṟkiḷavi' a synonym for uriccol found in Tolkāppiyam S. 482. Dr. P. S. Sastri, says, 'This and the word kuṟaiccoṟkiḷavi mentioned in the last but one sutra of Eluttatikāram clearly suggest that uriccol is the root of nouns or verbs. It cannot be taken to be identical with Sanskrit dhātu as mentioned by

1. Vendryes, Language, p. 117.
2. Suttira virutti. p. 47.
3. Pirayoka Vivekam, S. 18.
4. Teyvaccilaiyar, commentary on Tolkappiyam, S. 293.

Teyvaccilaiyār, since dhātu is, according to the Sanskrit Grammarians, a verbal root and since Tolkāppiyaṉār has not suggested anywhere in his work that all nouns are derived from verbal roots".[5] Though Dr. Sastri rightly expresses the defect of comparison drawn by Teyvaccilaiyār, he fully agrees with him in point of the nature of uriccol, i. e., uriccol comprises the nominal and verbal roots.

All the later grammarians and the commentators of the ancient grammar, Tolkappiyam, inspite of their slight differences in unimportant details, seeks to have agreed in one point that uriccol contains in itself all the roots, and nouns and verbs are derivable from it. The following extracts taken from 'Tamil Studies' by Mr. M. Srinivasa Aiyangar, will show somewhat the reason for their failure to understand the real meaning of uriccol :— "Most of them were acquainted with both Tamil and Sanskrit, yet they had greater love and reverence for the latter .... The authors of 'Nēminādam' and 'Vīrasōḷiam' and the commentators of the Tolkappiyam and the Kural countenanced the above view. Again, in the eighteenth century, the authors of 'Ilakkaṇakkottu' and 'Prayōga vivēkam', both of whom were good Sanskritists, boldly asserted that Tamil was a dialect of Sanskrit with a grammar common to both."[6]

The true significance of uriccol :

Tolkāppiyar has clearly pointed out his and his predecessors' opinion of the nature of uriccol in the line "uriccol kiḷaviyum, *avaṟṟuvaḷi* maruṅkin tōṉṟum *eṉpa*" (643). He has again expounded what he means by *avaṟṟu vaḷi* 'by the side of them' in the line 'peyariṉum viṉaiyiṉum mei taṭumāṟi' (781)

5. Dr. P. S. Sastri, History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil, p. 200.

6. M. Srinivasa Iiyangar, p. 152.

Uriccol, like Iṭaiccol, shows, on the face of it, that it has no independence and it must belong either to noun or verb. To suppose that those words exclusively belong to poetry or that those independent of Peyarccol and Viṉaiccol are termed as Uriccol will be easily shown as incorrect. In Tamil, there is no word set apart to be used solely in poetry. In my article on 'Vaḻakkum Ceyyuḷum' published in Tamilp-poḻil I have attempted to expose the hollowness of the commonly held view of the significance of Tiricol, quoting a considerable number of words which are even now in the daily use but which are considered to belong to the category of Tiricol by scholars.[7]

The word 'urimai' at all times, means only 'right' not 'independence'. We find this word expressing this meaning throughout the ancient classics.

> '*uyartiṇaikku urimaiyum ahṟiṇaikku urimaiyum*' (Tol. 644)
>
> '*urimai uṭaittu ivvulaku*' (Kural. 578)

By 'urripporuḷ' we understand that the subject treated in Akam literature is entitled only to the human beings.

The 120 words enumerated in 'uriyiyal' of Tolkappiyam do not suggest in the least that they could be the basic roots of noun or verb. Can anybody venture to say, after carefully studying these words that uriccol is defective either in form or in meaning? It is true that Tolkāppiyar has regarded uriccol as 'kuṟaiccolkiḷavi' (482). The latter expression unquestionably points out that uriccol has some defect of its own. What is that defect? The defect is mentioned in the definition of uriccol. Uriccol, incapable of being declined in all cases which the pure noun enjoys or being used in the

7. Dr. V. Sp. Manickam, Tolkappiyap putumai, p. 72.

imperative which characterises the pure verb but capable of being declined or conjugated in some respects is considered as a separate unit. Yet as the term uriccol suggests, it is bound to belong either to noun or verb, according to the circumstances in which it is put to use. Such a kind of uriccol seems to have sprung only from *isai*, 'sound' *kuṟippu* 'implication' *paṇpu* 'quality'. That this is the meaning expressed by the word kuṟaiccol kiḷavi is evident from the line,

'*peyarinum vinaiyinum mey taṭumaṟi*' (Tol. 781)

(appearing ambiguously as noun or verb)

Therefore, it may be concluded that uriccol is not the basic part of noun or verb but the defective nature of it. Then it naturally follows that the words *naṭa*, *vā*, etc., which enjoy the fuller application of the definition of verb can by no means be classified as uriccol and are purely verbal forms. The grammarians who propose that uriccol in itself contains all the roots of noun and verb fail to perceive that this advocacy of theirs renders the classifications of all words, primarily into noun and verb unnecessary and futile. Arasan Caṇmukaṉār in his Payira virutti has briefly criticized the false theory of the later grammarians. [8]

The unique nature of the verb :

There is another controversial subject which deserves discussion in this section. Iḷampūraṇar and Cēṉāvaraiyar show *uṇṭāṉ* 'he ate' as an instance of verb under the suttiram 'viṉai eṉappaṭuvatu' (Tol. 682). Following suit, Pavananti-yar has formulated thus:—

"*ceypavaṉ karuvi nilam ceyal kālam*
ceyporuḷ āṟum taruvatu viṉaiyē" (Nan. 320.)

8. Arasan Cammukanar, Payira virutti, p. 228

This and the illustration shown by the two commentators give rise to the new thought that verb means finite verb. The Nannūl Suttiram indicates only the significance of finite verb, not the definition of verb. *uṇṭāṉ* 'he ate' no doubt, is a verb. It would be the best example, if shown under the suttirams 112 and 421 of Tolkāppiyam. In the example *uṇṭāṉ*, '*uṇ*' alone is the verbal root. It alone deserves to be regarded as part of speech. The preterite sign *ṭ* and the pronominal suffix *aṉ* are appended to the verbal root, in accordance with the rule 'avaṟṟuvaḻi maruṅkiṉ tōṉṟum' (Tol. 643). These two appended particles are called 'Iṭaiccol'. A minute analysis of the suttiram,

> "*viṉai eṉappaṭuvatu vēṟṟumai koḷḷātu*
>
> *niṉaiyum kālai kālamoṭu tōṉṟum*" (Tol. 682)

makes it clear that the characteristic of verb is to possess only the *capacity* to indicate time. The commentators took a false position when they interpreted that the verb should include in itself the tense-sign too. It must be remembered here though the essential characteristic of a noun is its declension, nobody will say that *avaṉ* 'he' *avaḷ* 'she' etc., are not nouns because of no case-sign affixed. *maram* 'tree' is shown as an example of noun by the said commentators themselves. If the verbal root, tense-infix and the personal sign go to make up a verb, it is untenable to say, as Tolkāppiyar said '*niṉaiyum kālaik kālamotu tōṉṟum*'. (It will express time tacitly). Moreover we expect him say that not only time but the gender and number too will be apparent in a verb. Tolkāppiyar wishes us to understand by framing this suttiram 682 that expressing time is the part and parcel of a verbal root and it is the latent capacity of it. Naccināṟkkiṉiyar, another commentator of Tolkāppiyam, understanding the

real import of this suttirum shows *uṇ*, *tiṉ* etc., as examples of verb under it. This is the view that is acceptable.

The meanings of ' viṉai ' :

Viṉai, *ceyal*, and *toḻil* are commonly regarded as synonyms. But on closer examination, it will be found that a great difference lies in their meaning and usage. This distinction can be understood by a reference to the expressions, 'viṉaiyiyal' in Collatikaram and 'ceyuḷiyal', in Porulatikaram employed in Tolkappiyam, wherein ceyyuḷ is found to arise from the root *cey* (to do). As a verbal noun, it means "anything that is done or composed - a composition". The compounds like 'ceyviṉai' and 'viṉai ceyalvakai' also emphasize this distinction. Viṉaippeyar and Toḻiṟpeyar are the grammatical terms different in meaning. The former denotes the personal noun *naṭantāṉ* (one who walked) possessing the same form as that of the finite verb (he walked), while the latter denotes a verbal noun *naṭattal* (walking). Viṉai itself is a word with different meanings which are derived according to the context. It means deed in 'ceytu iraṅkā viṉai' (Puram. 10), employment in 'viṉaiyē āṭavaṟkku uyirē' (Kuruntokai. 135), an undertaking in 'āḷ viṉai', the results of action in former births in 'iruḷ cēr iruviṉai' (Kural. 5) and war in, viṉai naṉṟē (do. 673).

The origin of viṉai (வினை)

Viṉai, meaning 'a doing' as a verbal noun probably arose from the crude root *viṉ* meaning 'to do'. Viṉā meaning 'a question' also sprang probably from the same root, meaning a deed again but with special reference to a particular deed, namely questioning. 'Viṉā uṭai viṉaiccol'

(Tol. 728) contains the special and general meanings of the words formed from the same root.

'ā' in *viṉā* is a particle of specialisation restricting the meaning of the word to questioning or a question. Likewise, 'ai' in *viṉai* is a particle of specialisation, restricting the meaning in this word to 'a deed' as a noun. Whereas viṉā could be used both as a verb and as a noun, *viṉai* is used only as a noun.

2. THE NATURE OF VERBAL ROOTS

Three kinds of roots:

It is generally accepted that there are three kinds of roots in Tamil, viz. verbal roots, nominal roots and the roots common to both noun and verb. The common roots may be sub-divided into two classes. One set of roots are identical both in meaning and form, e. g. *aṇi*, as a verb means to adorn with ornaments; as a noun, an ornament; *tuṇi*, as a verb, to cut in pieces; as a noun a piece of cloth. Roots identical in forms but different in meanings constitute the second sub-division - e. g. *vil*, as a verb, to sell: as a noun, a bow. *ōṭu*, as a verb to run; as a noun, a tile. Dr. Caldwell seems to have made no mention of the existence of this sub-divison.

The common roots:

The existence of the common roots is not unknown to the earliest Tamil grammarians. The sole verbal roots *naṭa*, 'walk' *uṇ*, 'eat' *tiṉ* 'chew' etc., can never be declined, nor the roots entirely belonging to noun indicate time. The possibility of either having declension or conjugation rests only on the roots of the twofold use. In order to give clarity, Tolkāppiyar explains the nature of verb in a double way, i. e. positive and negative in the suttiram,

"*viṉaiyeṉap paṭuvatu vēṟṟumai koḷḷātu*

niṉaiyum kālaik kālamoṭu tōṉṟum" (Tol. 682)

(verb - a part of speech which has no declension and which will express time by implication).

Apparently, it appears inappropriate to say with reference to the nature of a verb *vēṟṟumai koḷḷātu* - a characteristic of the noun. But the existence of the common roots (for verb as well as noun) renders this statement necessary. In the verb form, it will take conjugation but not declension; in the noun form it will take declension but not conjugation, The latter point is also brought out by Tolkāppiyar's statement,

'*peyarnilaik kiḷavi kālam tōṉṟā*' (Tol. 533)

Thus the double description - positive and negative - is balanced for the verb form as well as the noun form by Tolkappiyar himself.

It seems, on scrutiny, what are called common roots are primarily the roots of verb. The so called indiscriminate common roots *aṇi*, *muṟi*, *col*, etc., denote at first verbal actions, to beautify, to break in two, and to speak. They become nouns only in their secondary meanings, like *aṇi*, that which is put on; *muṟi*, what is broken in two· *col*, what is spoken. To denote a secondary meaning without any mark of derivation is one of the peculiarities of the Tamil roots, i. e. denoting both action and its object. As this is the nature of this kind of verbal roots, they do not require any object in the accusative case. Nobody says *aṇiyai aṇi* and *collaic col*, as in the case of *vantēṉ* which is in no need of *nāṉ* as its nominative. Knowing this feature, Tolkāppiyar, the most reputed of the Tamil grammarians has laid the rule to his credit,

"valaṅkiyal maruṅkil kuṉṟuva kuṉṟum" (Tol. 596)

(In actual usage those that deserve to be ceased will cease)

Objection to Sivagnanamunivar's and others views:

Some of the statements made by certain commentators like Sivagnāṉamuṉivar and Āṟumuka Nāvalar, regarding the verbal and nominal roots reveal an imperfect understanding of the characteristics peculiar to the Tamil roots. They contend that a wōrd without any change in form cannot have a change in meaning and change in meaning necessarily involves also a change in form. They accept that *tirai,* 'to ripple' *nurai,* 'to froth' *taḷir,* 'to bud' *pū,* 'to bloom' *kāi,* 'to bear fruit' *kaṉi,* 'to ripen' and the like are originally verbal roots. They do not agree that these forms can by themselves denote things. They assert that they denote wave, froth, bud, blossom, unripen fruit, and fruit respectively, definitely having *i* a suffix of agency in the end. If so, the derivative forms would be *tiraii, nuraii, talirii, puii, kāii* and *kaṉii.* Nobody can deny that their argument is almost logically correct. Paul, a German philologist, says:- "Grammar and logic do not coincide, because the formotion and application of language does not proceed on the basis of strict logical inquiry, but by the natural and untrained movement of the groups of ideas, which either follows or not the agency of the laws more or less logical, according to the natural or acquired capacity of each individual."[1] The commentators' principle is applicable only to the derivatives from nouns like *muḷḷi* 'a thorny shrub' and *villi* 'a bower'. It does not hold good to the realm of verbal roots, capable of being used also as nouns which constitute by far the most numerous class. We do not come across anywhere in the extant Tamil literature from the age of Tolkāppiyam down to the present, such forms as *tiraii,*

1. Paul, Principles of the History of Language, p. 18.

nuraii, etc., as nouns. On the contrary, some of these forms were used in the ancient classics as verbal participles. Sivagnāṉamuṉivar and his followers evade the question as to the non-occurrence of *i* in those places, in the whole Tamil literature, by saying that *i* the suffix of agency is ever understood. They are anxious to introduce compulsorily a rule which has no precedent either in literature or in practice and which is against the fundamental principle of 'ilakkiyam kaṇṭu ataṟku ilakkaṇam iyampal'. (Nan. 141) 'Grammatical rules are evolved from the usage, oral or written. Even Aracañ Caṇmukaṉār, a great Tami scholar of the first half of this century, expressed his disagreement with this untenable view, but unfortunately failed to realize the inherent nature of the Tamil roots.[2] His argument is that the verbal roots *tirai, nurai*, etc., express the meanings wave, froth, etc., by means of metonomy. In metonomy, the expressed word should be a noun in order to suggest another related meaning as is given by the rule 'oṉṟaṉ peyarāṉ ataṟkuiyai piṟitai' (Nan. 290). As *tirai, nurai* and the like are verbal roots, his reasoning is objectionable.

Tolkāppiyar's classification :

Taking into consideration collectively all the verbal roots, including the appended formatives, we will find that the verbal roots in Tamil are of three kinds :- monosyllabic, dissyllabic and trisyllabic.

> " *ōreḻuttu orumoḻi īreḻuttu orumoḻi*
> *iraṇṭu iṟantu icaikkum toṭaṟmoḻi uḷappaṭa*
> *mūṉṟē moḻinilai tōṉṟiya neṟiyē.*" (Tol. 45)

This suttiram is a perfect analysis of the entire roots in Tamil. It is significant that the third classification is styled as '*toṭarmoḻi*'. '*Toṭarmoḻi*' does not mean a sentence but a word with more

2. Arasan Canmukanar, Payira Virutti, p. 227.

than two letters. Words having shortened u̧, like *aṉpu, varampu, aṇaṅku* etc., mostly fill up this class. In this language, so far as the verb is concerned, no word with more than four letters is to be found.

Dr. Caldwell, the father of the Dravidian Comparative Philology, has made us realise that 'the Dravidian roots may invariably be traced up to monosyllabic roots, by a careful removal of successive accretions'.[3] Though we do find that a large proportion of the Tamil verbal roots are dissyallabic and trisyllabic, we should not forget that the ultimate basis from which these roots have sprung are indeed monosyllabic. Yet, as the three kinds of roots are indispensable in daily use, Tolkāppiyar's classification of all the Tamil roots into ōreḻuttu orumoḻi, īreḻuttu orumoḻi and toṭarmoḻi educates us about the line of development of the roots and the daily practice.

The combination of verbal roots:

Let us now turn our attention to the study of the combination of verbal roots with nouns or some other forms, together with the significance of certain verbal roots which they have acquired in practice.

1. Some nouns have been prefixed to the verbal roots so that we find compound words with a noun and a verb used at all ages. I shall first adduce a few instances and then explain the peculiar construction of them.

(a)	*talai - kaviḻ*	'to hang down ones head'
	talai - kuṉi	'to hang down ones head'
	talai - koṭu	'to support'
	talai - acai	'to nod'
	talai - iṭu	'to interfere

3. Dr. Caldwell, A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, p. 196.

(b)	*kai - koṭu*	'to lend a helping hand'
	kai - nīṭṭu	'to attack'
	kai - pār	'to read the lines of the palm'
	kai - p - paṟṟu	'to seize'
	kai - y - āḷu	'to employ'
(c)	*kaṇ - vai*	'to cast the evil eye'
	kaṇ - ōṭu	'to be sympathetic'
	kaṇ - vaḷar	'to sleep'
	kaṇ - pōṭu	'to cast wistful looks'
	kaṇ - pār	'to show compassion'
(d)	*kāl - koḷ*	'to plant'
	kāl - āṭṭu	'to be in affluent position'
	kāl - vāṅku	'to retreat'
	kāl - vai	'to enter'
	kāl - āṟu	'to rest from walking'
(e)	*aṭi - kōl*	'to lay a foundation'
	aṭi - paṇi	'to surrender'
	aṭi - p - paṭu	'to become accustomed'
	aṭi - viḻ	'to fall prostrate'
	aṭi - vai	'to begin'

It is intereresting to note that the prefixed nouns are always the several parts of body like head, hand, eye, leg, foot, etc. These nouns prefixed to ordinary verbs such as, *kaviḻ, kuṉi, koṭu, pār, vai* entirely change their meanings. *Koṭu* means to give; but when it takes *talai* and *kai* as prefixes the compound words change to mean to undertake the whole business and to lend aid respectively. *vai* 'to lay' becomes

to mean to look at wistfully and to step, respectively when prefixed by *kaṇ* and *kāl*. *Asai* means to remove; but *talai-yasai* to nod the head in approval. *Vaḷar* means to grow; but *kaṇvaḷar* to sleep. Here we find abstract notions are expressed by figurative terms drawn from the physical world.

Nowdays some of the prefixed nouns do not find a place; yet the ordinary verbs themselves will suffice to indicate the figurative meaning which they expressed when they were associated with their corresponding prefixes. This may be explained by the law of association of ideas.

2. In the Sangam classics we come across a considerable number of instances where a verbal noun is combined with a verbal root. Of these two parts, the first has a particular meaning; the second a general meaning. The second element is restricted only to the words *taral* 'to give' and *varal* 'to come'. It alone has all conjugations. Examples are:—

aḻi-taral	'to become grief'	*aṉcu-varal*	'to fear'
peyar-taral	'to return'	*acai-varal*	'to move'
iḻi-taral	'to despise'	*tuyal-varal*	'to swing'
cūḻ-taral	'to think out'	*katu-varal*	'to hasten'

Of these two elements, the last is regularly conjugated, whereas the first is not affected. e. g., *aḻi-tantāṉ, aḻi-tara, aḻi-tantu, aḻi-tarum, aḻi-tariṉ*. The only difference which exists between the isolated verbal root and the second member of this compound word lies in this that the latter cannot be used as the second person singular or plural of the imperative like *aḻi-tā, aṉcu-vā* and so on. In the medieval period, these auxiliaries are not used. Consequently, the first real root takes the regular conjugation, like, *aḻintāṉ, aḻiya, aḻintu*

aḷiyum, *aḷiyiṉ*. When the second element disappeared, the first, like all other verbal roots, is capable of being used in the imperative mood. To use these compounds in our age however, seems to be pedantic.

3. In a few instances, we cannot altogether dispense with the use of the second part. The second member is absolutely necessary to convey the meaning and to pronounce the first. Instances are *paruvaral* 'suffering', *aṇavaral* 'to embrace', *ulamaral* 'to be perturbed', *alamaral* 'to be vexed' etc. These words are similar to the previous one in conjugation, but they differ from the former by the persistent use of the second element. In the examples shown above, it is a moot point as to whether *varal* or *maral* constitutes the second element. A. Kumarasami Pulavar holds *varal* to be the second member.[4] Considering the words *ulamantu* and *alamantu*, the verbal participles of *ulamaral* and *alamaral* and also the constant use of *taral* and *varal* as auxiliaries, we are prone to take his side. If *maral* is really the second element the verbal participles should be *ulamaruvi*, not *ulamantu*, and *alamaruvi*, not *alamantu*. But one may raise an objection that *v* before *m* will not disappear, quoting a parallel instance *valamvaral*. In support of the splitting-up into *alam-maral*, one may even produce an example, *kāmaru*, a combination of *kāmam+maru* or *kām+maru*, where *m* the final is elided. Yet for the present I prefer to subscribe to the view holding *varal* as the second part on the assumption that *v* is first assimilated by constant use and then is elided.

4. A peculiar combination is also found in the following illustrations:

kēṭṭī	*maṟantī*	*niṉṟī*	*kāṭṭī*
ceṉṟī	*kaḷaintī*	*eḷḷī*	

4. Vinaip pakupata Vilakkam, p. 6.

Here *ī* a verbal root 'to give' is appended to the verbal participle of preterite tense. This combination differs in many particulars from those of *iḷitaral* and *ulamaral*. *kēṭṭī* simply means *kēḷ* 'to hear'. It is *ī* the second element that is regularly conjugated, like *kēṭṭīmin*, *maṟantītōy*, *kāṭṭī yāyiṉ*, etc. In the instances *eḷḷī* and *kāṭtī*, '*i*' the sign of the verbal participle has disappeared before long *ī*. It is therefore wrong to split them into *eḷ*+*ī* and *kāṭṭu*+*ī*. These forms probably imply some sense of respect. Whereas, for example, *cel* means 'to go' *ceṉṟī* might mean 'please go' (cf. pōni in Telugu meaning 'let him go'). Tolkāppiyar has countenanced this peculiar combination as is evident from the suttiram,

> "*muṉṉilai muṉṉar īyum ēyum ;*
> *annilai marapiṉ meyūrntu varumē*" (Tol. 934)

(*ī* also will be suffixed to the second person when it has a suitable consonant)

5. *The auxiliary verbs :*

The words *tā*, *vā*, *ī* shown above as auxiliaries, lost their own significance and became appended to the verbs of different forms. Of these three words, as *tā* and *vā* themselves used to take *ī* as their appendix like *tantīyāyēl* and *vantīyāyāyiṉ*, *ī* alone is to be reckened with as the foremost verbal root which displayed the role of auxiliary at first. There are many reasons to confirm this supposition. The fact that *ī* has the advantage of being used in all grammatical forms including the second person singular of the imperative, when used as an auxiliary, the absence of single instance to show that *ī* ever stood in need of an appendix and the many functions which long *ī* or its shortened '*i*' fulfils in the domain of grammar, all go to prove its high antiquity. I am inclined to believe therefore that *ī* should top the list of

the Tamil verbs. *ī*, being the easiest vowel to pronounce and its meaning being the rudimentary one, we have every reason to hold that it was the earliest in origin.

iru and *iṭu* are most largely used as auxiliaries from the medieval period, like *eḻuntiru* and *naṭantiṭu*. They have almost taken the place of *ī* nowadays.

6. In Tamil, a verbal root is often repeated twice, occasionally thrice too, to denote completeness or quickness. e.g.

tēṭu tēṭeṉat tēṭiṉēṉ	'I searched throughly'
pōṭu pōṭeṉap pōṭṭēṉ	'I went ahead unhesitatingly'

Tolkāppiyar seems to have framed a rule for this repetition under certain circumstances;

"*viraicol aṭukkē mūṉṟu varampākum*" (Tol. 906

(Repetition of a word to denote haste should not exceed three times)

7. *A new kind of classification* :

The examination of the significance of the verbal roots leads us to place them into three groups :— (1) roots exclusively belonging to rational beings (2) roots belonging to irrational beings and (3) the roots which belong to both groups : *kaṟṟal* 'to learn', *paṭittal* 'to read', *eḻutal* 'to write', *ārāytal* 'to research', etc: resolve themselves into the first group. *pūttal* 'to bloom', *kāittal* 'to bear unripe fruit', *kaṉital* 'to ripen', *paḻuttal* 'to grow ripe', etc., belong to the second. Numerous words of this group may be transferred to the first by means of metaphor. *iṟa* 'to die', *piṟa* 'to be born', *uṇ* 'to eat', *uṟaṅku* 'to sleep', etc., are common to both. These

three classes may be subdivided into many categories; but it will be out of place here. To adduce a few examples here will be enough to show how these groups may be sub-divided without the least expense of enthusiasm.

Let us take the verbal root *in̲* 'to give birth', (ஈன்) which belongs to the common group. It has the exclusive use of feminine gender :

'īn̲r̲a poḻutil peritu uvakkum' (Kural. 69)
'īn̲r̲u iḷaippaṭṭa koṭuvāip pēṭai' (Akam. 3)

Nowhere in Tamil literature do we find a single instance as *īn̲r̲ān̲*. But *per̲u* 'to bring forth' is a common root to both genders. *pirital* 'separation' one of the five themes in Love Poetry is entirely used with the husband like 'talaivan̲ talaiviyai ppirintān̲'. It is harsh to the Tamil ears to say 'talaivi pirintāl'. *Iraṅkal* 'lamentation' another love theme is attributed only to the lady. Tolkāppiyar has given clue to this kind of classification in his suttiram,

"peyarin̲um toḻilin̲um piripavai yellām
mayaṅkal kūṭā vaḻakkuvaḻip paṭṭana" (Tol. 533)

(words common to nouns and verbs will denote either of them in usage. It should not be mistaken)

These refinements, however, have now been lost. A minute investigation into this field will not only be interesting but also instructive.

8. Idiomatic roots :

Tolkāppiyar has made an inquiry into the usage of a few verbs. He says that *tā* and *vā* are used only when the recipient

is in the first or in the second person and the words *cel* and *koṭu* belong to the third person. It is evident from this that the verbal roots themselves resolve into some particular pronouns, without any aid of construction. Thus in a sentence, *avaṉ poruḷaik koṭuttāṉ*, 'he gave (him) a thing' the dative case is understood; yet by rule, we may correctly supply the place with the word *avaṉukku*. It seems to me by this rule that the sentences *avaṉ eṉakkut tantāṉ*. 'he paid to me' *avaṉ eṉpāl vantāṉ* 'he came to me' might have sounded unidiomatic to the ancient scholars. Simply saying, *avaṉ tantāṉ* would mean 'he gave it to me' and *avaṉ vantaṉ* would express 'he came to me'. Tamil idiom requires no dative or locative case in these places.

9. Tolkāppiyar has also made clear the different meanings of *ī*, *tā* and *koṭu* which are considered synonyms in our days These three words are employed only in begging; yet they betray the status of the beggar. *ī* means 'to give to the inferior'; *tā*, to give as equals; and *koṭu* 'to give to the superior'. An interesting analogy will be here furnished from the book entitled 'Semantics' by Prof. Breal.

"When the popular mind has once devised a certain kind of differentiation, it is naturally tempted to complete the series. It is well known that there are languages in which the various acts of life are not designated in the same way if an exalted personage be concerned, as when the ordinary man is in question. The Cambodians do not designate the members of the body nor the daily operations of life by the same terms when speaking of the king, as when speaking of a mere individual. To express that a man eats, they used the word si: in speaking of a chief, they would say pisa: if they spoke of a bonze or of a king, it would be soi."[5]

---

5. Prof. Breal, Semantics, p. 35.

10. *The inherent capacity of verbal root*:

Philologists writing on the Dravidian structure of the verbal roots have unanimously agreed that the crude theme of the verb itself is expressive of the second person singular of the imperative. Almost all the commentators contradict this view and give different explanations. This will be discussed in due course.

3. CHANGES IN THE VERBAL ROOTS

The interpretation of a Nannūl Suttiram (139)

Dr. Caldwell in the section on 'Roots' has briefly treated this subject, taking illustrations, in the main, from nouns. As this thesis entirely devotes itself to 'Verbs' it is bound to deal with this subject quoting verbs as illustrations. Besides, this head needs an elaborate investigation, as it has been scarcely touched by grammarians, both ancient and medieval alike. Tolkāppiyar has said nothing of the changes which the roots either as noun or verb undergo, when added by any suffix. Pavaṇantiyār whose ambition is to study the composite nature of a single word, has countenanced the occurence of changes in the verbal root itself and laid a rule authorising such modifiations, in the suttiram,

"*viḷampiya pakuti vēṟātalum vitiyē*" (Nan. 139)

The meaning of this is that the said roots *naṭa*, *vā*, etc., will alter and the alteration is lawful. This is the interpretation given by Mailainātar, the first commentator of Naṉṉūl. The comment of Caṅkara namacivāyar and Civagnāṉamuṉivar to this suttiram is inappropriate to the context. *Pakuti* is an adaptation of the Sanskrit word 'pirakrti' the uninflected form of a word. It means that it is incapable of being altered. This idea is in the mind of these two commentators as is manifest from their own words 'vēṟupaṭātatu pirakiruti

yāmanṟi. vēṟupaṭṭatu pirakiruti ākātu'. They contend that the changes in the roots are not to be treated separately, as *vikāram*, one of the constituents of the divisible word includes them. But as the author of Naṉṉūl has indicated the changes to which the uncompounded words of quality and the suffixes of person are subject, in the following suttirams :

'*īṟu pōtal iṭaiyukaram iyyātal*' (Nan. 136)

'*ā ō ākalum ceyyuḷuḷ urittē*' (Nan 353)

outside the jurisdiction of *vikāram*, our inference that the suttiram (viḷampiya pakuti) in question purports to hint the changes occurring in roots themselves is reasonable. Then the interpretation of Mailainātar holds good.

Though this is an elaborate subject, I restrict myself to mention only the major changes which the actual verbal root undergoes, on the addition of the signs of person and time and on the conversion into verbal noun and the causative form. According to a rule in Naṉṉūl, there are twenty-three endings in which all words terminate (eleven vowels, eleven consonants and one short u). For the sake of clearness and simplicity, each ending will be discussed individually, in the order given by Naṉṉūl.

Vowel endings :

1.	*naṭa*	*naṭi*	*naṭu*
2.	*ira*	*iri*	*iru*
3.	*iḻa*	*iḻi*	*iḻu*
4.	*uḻa*	*uḻi*	*uḻu*
5.	*maṟa*	*maṟi*	*maṟu*

These examples indicate how the primary vowels *a*, *i* and *u* play an important function, in the specialisation of meanings, without altering the preceding consonants. Possibly the whole series of them have an ulterior relationship, in virtue of their possession in common, the same nuclei or radical bases, the central consonants ṭ, r, ḷ, ṟ and the same generic signification.

1. *a ending* : (அ)

The roots of this termination are without exception dissylabic.

naṭa 'to walk' :— its transitive verb sometimes becomes *naṭāttu*, instead of *naṭattu* cf. '*yāṉā naṭāttukiṉṟēṉ*' (Kārikai).

cuma 'to bear' : It becomes *cummā* 'with no purpose' colloquially, instead of *cumavātu*, in the negative verbal participle.

Verbal noun :— a few verbs form their verbal nouns thus; *naṭai*, *cumai*, *paṟai*, *valai*, etc.

Verbal and relative participles :— In ancient classics some of the roots of this kind have probably taken the forms *naṭaii*, *naṭaiiya*, *kaṭaii* and *kaṭaiiya*. That is, the forms of the verbal nouns are the bases from which the verbal and relative participles are effected.

2. *ā ending* : (ஆ)

Most of the words of this ending are monosyllabic. A few words like *ankā* 'to open the month' and *annā* 'to gape' are also to be found.

cā 'to die' :— it becomes *ce* in the preterite tense like *ceṭṭāṉ*.

yā 'to bind' :— After the Sangam period this root has practically lost its initial consonant and has become similar in form to *ā* 'to become'. *yākkai* > *ākkai*.

vā and *tā* 'to jump over'. *tā* has also the meaning 'to spread'. These are the two words which originally and really bear this termination. The grammatical forms of these words differ very much from those of *vā* 'to come' and *tā* 'to give' the corrupted forms of varu and taru respectively.

koṇā 'to bring' :— Aṟumuka Nāvalar says that it changes into *koṇar*.

3. *i ending* : (இ)

Verbal noun .— *paṇi* becomes *pāṇi*; *tuṇi* > *tūṇi*; and *kuṉi* > *kūṉ*.

4. *i ending*:— (ஈ)

This ending calls for no remark.

5. *u ending* : (உ)

(a) lengthening of the initial vowel to form verbal noun :-

keṭu becomes *kēṭu*; *paṭu* > *pāṭu*; and *cuṭu* > *cūṭu*.

(b) changing of u into ai for the above purpose ;-

taku becomes *takai*; *aṛu* > *aṟai*; and *uṭu* > *uṭai*.

(c) to lengthen the initial vowel and change the final:-

viṭu becomes not only *vīṭu* but *viṭai*; *iṟu*, *īṟu* *iṟai*; and *uṟu*, *ūṟu*, *uṟai*.

(d) lengthening of the initial vowel as a compensation for the final u :-

viḻu > *vīḻ* ; *eḻu* > *ēḻ*.

(e) lengthening of the final vowel :-

taḻu > *taḻū* ; *veru* > *verū* ; *kuḻu* > *kuḻū*,

(f) reduplication of the consonants in the preterite tense :-

viṭu - *viṭṭa*; *miku* - *mikka*; *paṭu* - *paṭṭa*.

(g) formation of the preterite tense from the verbal noun :-

nakai - *nakaittēṉ*; *pakai* - *pakaittēṉ*; *muyaṟci* - *muyaṟcittēṉ*.

(h) lengthening of the penultimate vowel for euphony :—

paravu - *parāvu* ; *viravu* - *virāvu*.

(i) *varu* and *taru* :- As this is the original ending of these words, I have shown under this head. These words have kept '*r*' in all the grammatical expressions save the imperative and the preterite tense. *Vāram* 'week' may be derived from *varu*.

6. *ū ending* : (ஊ)

Only a very few verbs take this ending. *kū* sometimes is compounded with other words like *aṟaikū* 'to challenge' and *iṉaikū* 'to cry'.

7. *ē ending* : (ஏ)

Vē 'to boil' becomes *ve* (வெ) in the preterite tense. It retains its long vowel in all other connections. I cherish a doubt about the long vowel of this word which will be discussed in the next chapter.

8. *ai ending* : (ஐ)

(a) *ai* wholly disappears in some grammatical connections like *kaṭkum*, *taṭkum*, *vittum*. Their roots are *kaḷai*, *taḷai*, *vitai* respectively

(b) It is sometimes subject to extraordinary alterations *kai* 'to be bitter' changes into kaca. *vai* 'to abuse' becomes *vacavu* or *vacai*. In this change a consonant *c* generally appears. Even in noun *mai* 'ink' becomes *maci*.

(c) It greatly evidences a tendency to become *a* in the colloquial; e.g., *vaittāṉ* > *vaccāṉ*; *taittāṉ* > *taccāṉ*.

9. *o ending*: (ஒ)

no 'to suffer' (நொ) alone has this ending. It is lengthened in all forms except in the preterite. The original form of '*no*' is in doubt. It will be discussed along with *vē*.

10. *ō ending* : (ஓ)

pō 'to go' is a softened form of *pōku*. Its original form will be discussed along with '*āku*' in the next chapter. It is to be remembered that it was not a verb in the days of Tolkāppiyar and its meaning also was different from that of the present day.

11. *au ending* : (ஔ)

vau and *kau* 'to seize' (வௌ, கௌ) are only two words in possession of this ending. They sometimes have been written as well as pronounced as *vav* and *kav* (வவ், கவ்). Even the author of Naṉṉūl has written thus : '*tēy pār cel vav*' in the suttiram 137. Therefore this ending gradually becomes obscure.

A peculiarity noticeable in the change of root - vowels :

'to divide' *paku* (a+u) becomes *pā*
'to spare' *miku* (i+u) ,, *mī*
'to enter' *puku* (u+u) ,, *pō*

From these illustrations adduced, we notice how the two short vowels associate themselves into a long one after completely eliminating the consonant in the middle. Curiously enough, these corrupted verbs take the same grammatical forms, as though they were the real ones :

paku :- *pakuttatu*, *pakuttu*.

pā :- *pāttatu*, *pāttu*.

'*pāttarum paṇpa*' (Cilampu. XI)

miku :- *mikuntatu*, *mikuntu*.

mī :- *mīntatu*, *mīntu*.

puku :- *pukuntatu*, *pukuntu*.

pō :- *pōntatu*, *pontu*.

'*pōntu acainta muralvāic caṅkam*' (Cilampu. VII)

This corrupted root *pō* 'to enter' (புகு) should not be confused with *pō* another corrupted root of *pōku* 'to go' (போ) though

certain poets and scholars have used as if they were one. *Pō* 'to go' will take the forms *pōṉēṉ*, *pōṉa* or *pōkiya*, *pōyiṉa*, etc., but '*pō*' the corruption of *puku* will take the forms *pōntēṉ*, *pōnta*, *pōntaṉa*, etc. It is clear now that these two sets of examples are originally different from one another, yet confusion has been made by the indifferent use in later period. Likewise *pā* the corruption of *paku* 'to divide' is different from the original *pā* 'to spread' though the forms seem to be identical. *pā* 'to spread' will take the forms pāyatu, pāya, pāyiṉa, etc., whereas *pā* 'to divide' will take *pāttatu*, *pātta*, *pāttaṉa*, etc. in conjugation. These two have their distinct usage in literature even now.

***Consonant endings* :**

12. *ñ ending* : (ஞ்)

Only one verbal root has this ending. That is *uriñ* 'to rub one's self'. This invariably takes '*cu*' for enunciation in the end. Thus *uriñcu* is the base for all grammatical expressions.

'*tiṅkāl naṟuṅkuṟaṭu uriñciya*' (Muruka: 32)

Even in viṉaittokai like '*ā uriñcu taṟi*, *uriñcu* is employed. It may be said that this *ñ* ending does not exist now.

13. *n ending*: (ந்)

There are two words *porun*, a verb and *verin*, a noun with this ending. *porun* 'to act' has taken *tu* as a help to enunciation and has changed into *poruntu* differing in meaning with the similar form *poruntu* 'to agree' the piṟaviṉai form of which is *poruttu*.

14. *m ending*: (ம்)

Tirum 'to return' is only one verb with this ending. It has become in use *tirumpu* with the addition of *pu*. It is

curious to know how these three endings or words *uriñ*, *porun* and *tirum* have become *uriñcu*, *poruntu* and *tirumpu*. The three newly added vowel-consonants *cu*, *tu* and *pu* are not formatives, the purpose of which, as Dr. Caldwell defines, is to show intransitives.[1] *uriñ*, *porun* and *tirum* are themselves ta<u>n</u>vi<u>n</u>ai. If so, what is the nature of these additions? Let us take '*tirum*' for explanation. *Puṟam* 'outside' becomes *puṟampu*. cf. '*puṟampu aṇaiyā<u>n</u> vāḷkōṭṭam*' (Cilampu. IX). It is therefore manifest that '*m*' takes the enunciative *u* with the hard consonant *p* merely for the vocalisation. In this manner, *tirum* has become *tirumpu*. This rule has another example in the word *paṟampu* in the line of Puṟanā<u>n</u>ūṟu '*aḷitō tā<u>n</u>ē pāriyatu paṟampe*' (Puram. 109). *paṟam* should be regarded as the real word, *pu* being added as in *purampu* and *tirumpu*, as is evident from the poem '*paṟa nāṭṭup peṇṭir aṭi*' and from the expression '*paṟanāṭṭup peruṅkoṟṟa<u>n</u>ār*' the author of a poem 323 of Akanā<u>n</u>ūṟu. Thus *paṟam* or *paṟampu*, the name of the country seems to have shifted its meaning to the mountain which is in the country itself and thereby to have become a synonym with *malai* 'mountain'. This tendeney to make addition for the sake of vocalisation is found even in pronouncing foreign words, e. g., room becomes roompu in Tamil.

An in *tirumpu*, *m* is the root ending, so in *uriñcu* and *poruntu*, *ñ* and *n* should be taken as real endings. It is wrong to split them into *urim+cu* and *porum+tu*, on the analogy of *peruñ cuvar*, and *perun tiṇai*. As Tolkāppiyar has said that *u* alone will be added to these consonantal verbs, it must be correctly inferred that *c*, *t* and *p* are later developments, The familiarity with the piṟavi<u>n</u>ai verbs *tiruppu* and *poruttu* wrongly leads us to hold *tirumpu* and *poruntu* as their ta<u>n</u>vi<u>n</u>ais. Nobody will think *uruṇṭu* and *uṇṭu* as ta<u>n</u>viñai on the ground that their piṟavi<u>n</u>ai forms are *uruṭṭu* and *ūṭṭu*. *uruḷ* and *uṇ* are their tānviñai forms. It is therefore accurate to hold *tirum*,

1. A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, p. 198.

porun and *uriñ* as real tan̲vin̲ai forms. Pavaṇantiyar seems to be at fault when he mentions simply following Tolkāppiyam that these endings will require only *u* (உ) as against the instances uriñcu, poruntu and tirumpu which were in vogue in his time.

15. *ṇ ending*: (ண்)

Under this ending, we see two sets of verbs one beginning with a short vowel like *uṇ*, *maṇ*, *paṇ* etc., and the other with a long vowel like *kāṇ*, *pūn*, etc.

uṇ 'to eat': It has been lengthened into *ūṇ* in verbal noun and *ūṭṭu* in pir̲avin̲ai. *kān* 'to see': it becomes shortened in the preterite *kaṇṭān̲*.

The general change of *ṇ* into *ṭ* in combination of two words is not considered here because of its little importance.

16. *n̲ ending*: (ன்)

min̲ and *tin̲* become *mīn̲* and *tīn̲* or *tīn̲i* in nouns.

17. *y ending*: (ய்)

tīy 'to be charred' has omitted its ending even in ancient times 'ilai tīnta ulavaiyāl' (Kali: 11).

In the colloquial, *tēñca*, *kāñca* and *ōñca* are used for *tēynta*, *kāynta* and *ōynta*.

18. *r ending*: (ர்)

ārntu has become *aruntupu* in Akanān̲ūr̲u 3. *ār* > *aru.*

19. *l ending*: (ல்)

(a) *l* changes irregularly in many words.

kar̲r̲ān̲, *cen̲r̲ān̲*, *pullinām*

roots: *kal. cel*, *pul.*

(b) *kol* and *nil* become *kolaiiya* and *nilaiiya* in the verbal participle.

(c) *cel, vel* and *kol* form their verbal nouns by means of lengthening the initial vowel and by the addition of a suffix of the verbal noun like *cēṟal, vēṟal,* and *kōṟal.* In this connection it is desirable to note that *cēl,* 'a fish', *vēl* 'a spear' and *kōl* 'a rod' may be derived from *cel, vel* and *kol.*

(d) *ival* 'to move' changes into *ēl* and takes the forms *ēṉṟu, ēṉṟāṉ* etc.

(e) *nōl* 'to suffer' (நோல்) From the instances *nōṉāṉ, nōṉār, nōṉṟāḷ* and *nōṉpu,* one would assume that *nōṉ* should be the root; but *nōlātavar* (Kural. 270) stands against it. As we do not find no other instances than this, it is hard to take *nōl* as the root. *nōṟṟal* and *nōṟpār* may be split up as either *l* or *ṉ* ending. The comparison with other examples like *mēṉa* from *mēla, nāṉku* from *nālku, aṉ* the suffix of the first person from *al,* leads us to favour *nōl* as the root. The Tamil rule admits only of the change from *l* to ṉ and not the reverse. The root *ēl* which takes *ēṉṟāṉ* in the affirmative and *ēlātavar* in the negative confirms our supposition that *nōl* should be the root in the forms *nōṉṟāṉ* and *nōlātavar.*

20. *v ending :* (வ்)

There is no verb in this ending.

21. *ḻ ending* : (ழ்)

ḻ suffered no change in ancient days: but in the medieval period when *ḻ* was pronounced like *ḷ* (ள்) the change which it had taken was also similar to that of ḷ. *viṭṭi* instead of *viḻtti* and *vāṇāḷ* for *vāḻnāḷ* are thus formed. Colloquially *ḻ* suffers great changes and often loses its existence. That is the fate of the letter *ḻ* the exclusive property of the Tamil language.

vī 'to die' may be traceable from *vīḻ*.

'iṇaiyaṭi toḻutu vīḻntaṉaḷē' (Cilampu. XX)

Here *vīḻntaṉaḷ* seems to have the meaning of *vīntaṉaḷ*.

22. *ḷ ending :* (ள்)

koḷ is lengthened in verbal noun as *kōḷ*. The general change of *ḷ* into *ṇ* or *ṭ* in combination of two words is not considered here because of its little importance.

23. *The shortened u :*

A considerable number of Tamil verbs terminate in *u*.

(a) The verbal nouns are formed by means of doubling the final consonants. e.g., *pōku - pōkku*; *kūṭu - kūṭṭu*.

This change mostly takes place in neṭiṟṟoṭark – kuṟṟi yalukaram.

(b) A verbal root of one of the six divisions of kuṟṟiyal ukaram becomes another by the mere internal changes :-

e.g. *muḻuku – mūḻku*; *tēṭu - tēṇṭu*; *kūṭu - kūṇṭu*.

The foregoing analaysis of the changes in the verbal roots, classified according to each ending, will prove that in all the forms and under every shape which a verb can assume, the radical base remains unchanged, or is so slightly changed that its original form can be readily recognised with no great effort. To use the words of Dr. Caldwell. 'the root always stands out in distinct relief, unobscured, though surrounded by a large family of auxiliary affixes.[2]

The next chapter is devoted to inquire into some of the verbs, the crude forms of which are at first sight unrecognisable but on scrutiny are clearly perceptible.

2. A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, p. 197.

4. SOME VERBAL ROOTS - AN EXAMINATION

1. *āku 'to become' and pōku 'to go':*

The question whether the root is *ā* or *āku* and *pō* or *pōku* has vexed the mind of Tamil scholars from the medieval period. It is a matter for doubt as to from what original roots the verbal forms had developed in literature and in practice.

ā or *āku*			*pō* or *pōku*		
āyina	or	*ākiṉa*	*pōyiṉa*	or	*pōkiṉa*
āya	,,	*ākiya*	*pōya*	,,	*pōkiya*
āy	,,	*āki*	*pōy*	,,	*pōki*
āyiṉ	,,	*ākiṉ*	*pōyiṉ*	,,	*pōkiṉ*
ātal	,,	*ākutal*	*pōtal*	,,	*pōkutal*
āvatu	,,	*ākuvatu*	*pōtal*	,,	*pōkal*

From these instances, though they are numerous, we cannot definitely decide which form is original.

As Cēṉāvaraiyar has mentioned both the forms *āy* and *āki*, *pōy* and *pōki* in Tolkāppiyam commenting on S. 228, it is to be presumed that he has accepted *ā* and *āku*, *pō* and *pōku*, as the two forms of the same verb. But in another place in

the same suttiram, he has explained the examples *pōkiyar* and *pōkiya* of the future verbal participles as having inserted *k*. As such, his view is to hold *ā* and *pō* as the real verbal themes. Naccinārkkiṉiyar has plainly said that *ā* and *pō* are original; but he is silent with regard to *āku* and *pōku* to be found in Tolkāppiyam of which he is a commentator. Pavaṇantiyār, the author of Naṉṉūl has indirectly but clearly put forth his view as *pō* is the original in the suttirm, '*noṭa vā maṭi cī viṭu kū vē vai* no *pō*' (137). Parimēlaḷakar is of opinion that *āku* and *pōku* may be the roots (Kural. 317). As it is hard to find out the original of these words, Swaminata Decikar, the author of Ilakkaṇakkottu, keeps silent simply narrating the different views of the scholars as regards these two words.[1] Dr. Caldwell appears to support the side of those who take āku and pōku as originals; but he is inclined to discard the final ku as a formative.[2]

Tolkāppiyam the earliest extant Tamil grammar comes to our rescue in deciding with certainty about the true nature of these two words. Let us take at first ā or āku for consideration. In the text of Tolkāppiyam, we find that k the consonant makes its appearance abundantly in the affirmative and persistently in the negative to wit, *ākum, ākā, ākātu, ākiya, ākiṭaṉ, ākkam, ākal, iranṭākuvatē*, etc. Eventhough we are in the habit of using *āya* and *āy* side by side with ākiya and āki in the affirmative, the appearance of k is unavoidable in the negative voice, like *ākātu, ākātaṉa, ākāta*, and *ākā*.

There are two ways by which we can find out and ascertain the real forms of doubtful verbs. One way, according to Dr. Caldwell and the other Dravidian philologists is to find out the form of the imperative singular and thus to

1. Ilakkanakkottu S. 86.

2. A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, p. 199.

recognise in surety the real root of the verb. In most cases, this principle seems to hold good. When that way fails to clear our doubt, there is another way to which we may resort - a way which never betrays us. Viṉaittokai is one of the six compounds in Tamil. It consists of two members. The first is a bare verbal root and the second a noun. The first member which constitutes viṉaittokai will be an infallible means in deciding the original form of any verb. In the instances *ākūḷ*, *ākāṟu*, *ākiṭaṉ*, and *aḷavāku moḻimutal* we find *āku* used in pure verbal forms. As *ku* is indispensable in the negative and appears in the affirmative in compound words, I am in favour of the theory that āku is the original form and that ku is understood in those affirmative instances of *āpa*, *āvatu*, *ātum*, *āti* etc. Kāviñchu, the Telugu causal will prove beyond doubt that *k* or *ku* is formerly radical part of *āku*.

Let us now take *pō* or *pōku* for consideration. From the foregoing explanations, it seems that *pōku* is original and *pō* is the softened form of it. Nobody can imagine the change of uriccol into viṉaiccol (verb). This change has actually taken place in the case of *pōku*. This alteration is a tremendous one in the field of Tamil grammar. *pōku* was regarded not as a verb but as an uriccol by the ancient grammarians. Moreover *pōku* is never used in Tolkāppiyam in the meaning 'to go'. The state of being straight and long is meant by it. These facts are evident from the suttiram found in 'uriyiyal',

> " *vārtal pōkal oḻukal mūṉṟum*
>
> *nērvum neṭumaiyum ceyyum poruḷa* " (Tol. 799)

In Tolkāppiyam without exception and in the Sangam classics in many places, the work *pōku* is used in the sense mentioned above.

'pōkia tiṟattu naṟṟāi pulampal' (Tol. 981)

'kaḷḷi pōkiya kaḷariyam paṟantalai' (Puram. 237)

'puṇṇiya neṭuvarai pōkiya neṭuṅkaḷai' (Cilampu. III)

The verb *cel* was generally used in those days to express the meaning 'to go'.

'tamē cellum tāyarum uḷarē' (Tol. 982)

'ceṉṟu payaṉetirac coṉṉa pakkamum' (Tol. 1036)

'celaviṭai aḻuṅkal cellāmai aṉṟē' (Tol. 1130)

In these lines of Tolkāppiyam, we can easily substitute *pō* for *cel.* It is therefore obvious that *pō* has taken the position of *cel* which is now disappearing even in literature. *pōku* an uriccol has all sorts of usage as if it were a verb. *pō* or *pōku* and cel have been considered synonyms from the medieval period; but they had a distinct usage in the days of Tolkāppiyar as is evident from the line *puṭai ketap pōkiya celavē* (Tol. 1003).

Tirukkural, a didactic work of the post - Sangam period makes frequent use of *pō* the corruption of *pōku* in place of *cel.*

'puṟattāṟiṟ pōoyp peṟuvatu evaṉ' (46)

'avvuyir pōmaḷavum ōr nōy' (848)

'kaṇṇuḷḷiṟ pōkar' (1126)

Thus, it is lavishly used in this sense in literature from the age of Tirukkural.

In the combination of viṉaittokai *pōku*, not *pō*, constitutes the first member. Examples are 'pōkiṭai kaḷiyana' (Cilampu XI)

and 'pōkuyar purraḷai' (Mani. XX). From the above explanation, we have every reason to conculde that *pōku* is the original form and that though ku is elimintated in the instances of pōya, pōy, pōvatu, etc., it makes its persistent appearance in the negative forms. *Pōku* is an uriccol in its origin, according to the definition of Tolkāppiyam and pertains to the class of paṇpu, one of the three sources mentioned in the line 'icaiyiṉum kuṟippinum paṇpiṉum tōṉṟi' (781). To make the above view clear, I will adduce another example in the word *pōkku* which even now means manner or way and which is hardly considered a piṟaviṉai form of *pōku*.

An analogy to the change of an uriccol into viṉaiccol is to be found in the word *uva* (உவ) 'to be happy'. That it is by origin an uriccol is evident from the suttiram "uvappē uvakai" (Tol. 788). It is used as a pure verb in the imperative mood in a line '*uva iṉi vāḷi tōḷi*' found in Akanāṉūru (65).

2. *vā* (வா) *'to come' and tā* (தா) *'to give'*

Before proceeding to inquire into the original forms of these two verbs, it is desirable to make some preliminary remarks for perspicuity. It is to be remembered at first that *vā* and *tā* do not possess the only meanings now attributed to them. They also mean 'to jump over.' It is wrong to suppose that vā and tā are the words with several meanings. The words *vā* and *tā*. the meaning of which is 'to jump over' are entirely different from the similar forms whose meanings are 'to come' and 'to give'.

(*a*) '*vā māṉatu vakai uraittaṉṟu*' (Venpāmālai. 90.)

(*b*) '*vām puravi vaḷuti*'

(*c*) '*aṭi aḷāntāṉ tāyatu*' (Kural 610)

(*d*) '*tāviya cēvaṭi cēppa*' (Cilampu. XVII)

From these quotations, one could easily find that they are two verbs vā and tā as distinguished from these under discussion. These vā and tā whose meaning is "to jump over" may be said to have the real termination in ā. The simplicity of their conjugation through all tenses and persons will be self-evident to indicate that these two verbs are the real ā endings. On the other hand the irregular mode in which the vā and tā in question are conjugated and the different forms which they take will suffice to show at least that ā is not the original ending of the verbs. The various forms wherein *vā* 'to come' and *tā* 'to give' assume in conjugation are as follows :—

	vā	*tā*
1. *Imperative singular*	*vā*	*tā*
2. *Imperative plural*	*vammiṉ*	*tammiṉ*
	or	*or*
	vammoṉ	*tammō*
3. *Future tense*	*varuvaṉ*	*taruvāṉ*
4. *Present Tense*	*varukiṉṟāṉ*	*tarukiṉṟāṉ*
5. *Past tense*	*vantāṉ*	*tantāṉ*
6. *Infinitive*	*vara*	*tara*
7. *Subjunctive*	*vantāl*	*tantāl*
	or	*or*
	variṉ	*tariṉ*
8. *Negative*	*vārāṉ*	*tārāṉ*
9. *Verbal noun*	*varukai*	*tarukai*
	or	*or*
	varavu	*taravu*

In the singular and plural of the imperative '*r*' (*ṙ*) is not found. The future and present tenses, the infinitive and subjunctive moods, negative voice and the verbal noun invariably possess '*r*'. Long vowel *ā* appears only in the singular of the imperative and in all the negative forms, while 'a' appears in all other grammatical forms. In a few places vārātē and tārātē in the negative and vārum and tārum in the plural of the imperative r and ā are to be found. It is manifest now that the numerous forms would bewilder one in tracing the original themes of these verbs. Yet I fervently hope that among these multifarious forms, the real root is hidden.

Dr. Caldwell who, more than others has taken the trouble of discovering the true forms of these verbs, says about the inexplicable nature of them: "There are two verbs in Tamil, vā, to come, tā, to give, which involve peculiarities of which it is difficult to give a satisfactory explanation" and concludes thus "Notwithstanding this, I am not disposed to regard the forms in vā and tā as having found their way into the conjugation of the verbs by mistake. It is evident that vā and tā, not var and tar, are the themes from which the preterites vandē<u>n</u> and tandē<u>n</u> have been formed, and which we find pure in the imperatives. We seem therefore driven to adopt Dr. Gundert's suggestion that vā and var, and tā and tar, are alternative roots - perhaps it would be preferable to say, different forms of the same root" [3]. This view of Dr. Gundert supported by Dr. Caldwell is not acceptable; for, we do not find an analogy in Tamil, i e. the existence of the different forms of the same root. If his view were to be accepted, *cā* and *ce*, and *vē* and *ve* should be held as alternative roots because ce and ve are in the preterites. Moreover this would militate against the principle of Tamil syllabation; for according to the rule "*ṛakāra ḻakāram kuṟṟoṟṟu ākā*" (Tol. 49)

3. A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, p. 216.

'ṟ' preceded by a short vowel will not constitute a word. Yet I confess that their view gives clue to find out the real root. I wish to propose *varu* and *taru* to be the verbal bases which might have been used even in the singular of the imperative at a more ancient period of the Tamil language. This theory will then show that Tolkāppiyam, the only extant ancient Grammar is not so ancient as many of us think, when we take into account the antiquity of the Tamil idiom.

ā in *vā* and *tā* is not their original ending. I have mentioned in the preceding chapter the peculiar change of *paku*, *miku*, and *puku* into *pā*, *mī* and *pō* and explained how the initial vowel a, i, or u and the final u, phonetically coalesce into ā, retaining the first consonant and eliminating the last. In like manner, *varu* changed into *vā* even prior to Tolkāppiyam. Like the word *pō*, *vā* has taken the place of *varu*, in the imperative.

vantēṉ is not to be derived from *vā*, though we can cite ventāṉ from *vē*, as an analogy. It is safely traceable from *varu*. *varuntēṉ*, *varuntāṉ*, and *varuntāy* the preterites are corrupted into *vantēṉ*, *vantāṉ* and *vantāy*. It seems to me that Dr. Caldwell himself confirms the above supposition when he has put *varuntāy* within the brackets as a substitute for *vantāy*.[4]

Numerous evidences are there to show that the vowel - consonant *ru* always evinces a tendency towards absorption. Examples are *ampal* for *arumpal* 'to bud': *uṇṭai* for *uruṉṭai* 'ball'; and *ottaṉ* for *oruttaṉ* 'a man'. Thus *ru* has a tendency to disappear when preceded by a short vowel. Similarly *varuntēṉ*, *varumiṉ*, etc., discarding altogether *ru* in the middle become *vantēṉ* and *vammin*. These corrupted forms i.e., *vantēṉ* for *varuntēṉ*; *vantāy* for *varuntāy* and so on, have become

4. A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, p. 502.

popular and the poets also have bestowed their consent to them in order to avoid collision with the preterites *varuntēn*, *varuntāy*, etc., formed from *varuntu* 'to suffer' That to differentiate every word by every means with a view to make the language unambiguous and to avoid confusion in the exchange of ideas is one of the fundamental principles of Semantics. T. G. Tucker in his 'Introduction to the Natural History of Language' observes :- "The aim of language in its evolution is to express every possible notion in distinction from every other". *vantēn* is an example of this principle. This will be attested by another fact. As the difference between *varukinrān* and *varuvān*, the present and future tenses of *varu* 'to come' and *varuntukinrān* and *varuntuvān* of *varuntu* 'to suffer' is effected in some other way, *ru* is in no need of absorption here.

I have hitherto explained the change of *varu* into *vā* and *vantēn*. But in the instances of *vārum*, the imperative form of plural, and *vārākkāl*, *vārān* and *vārāmai*, the negative forms of all sorts, *vār* requires explanation. It also is a corruption of *varu*, the original root. Compare *ōr* from *oru*, *kār* from *karu*, and also *tēr* 'chariot' probably from *teru*. It is significant that vār (வார்) is used as the second person of the singular imperative in the Paripāṭal and Villi Pāratam :

'*vantikka vārena manattakka nōyitu*' (Pari. XX-70)

'*vār atā unakku yātu*' (Pāratam Vet. 12)

The foregoing investigation will briefly show that *varu* will change into two kinds, *vā* and *vā*r. One thing stands in the way of finally accepting the view '*varu*' to be the original. In the instances *paku*, *miku* and *puku* shown above, the consonant which disappears is *k*; but the consonant in varu is *r*. It is therefore fit to adduce a few examples in which r is elided. The examples which I am going to cite will be

illustrative of the point that *vār* and *vā* are the corruption of *varu*. *karu* changes into *kār* and *kā* in *kākkai* 'crow'; *peru* into *pēr* and *pē* in *pēy* 'devil'; *oru* into *ōr* and *ō* in *ōm* 'consent'; *aru* (mai) into *ār* and *ā* (interjection) and *ceru* into *cēr* and *cē* in *cēkkai* 'bed'. Similarly *varu* changes into *vār* and *vā*. Of all the Tamil consonants, *y*, *r*, and *ḻ* are most liable to change, when they are in the middle. Their change is frequently perceptible in the speech of the uneducated mass and sometime the educated too. Tolkāppiyar has used *vara* (வர) twice in the optative mood, adding 'a' to the original root *varu* :

'piṉ vara eṉṟalum' (Tol. 1059)

'Iraviṉum pakaliṉum nī vara eṉṟalum' Tol. 1155)

In order to emphasise the view that *varu* and *taru* alone are the crude roots from which all the forms shown above have sprung, I will point out one more evidence which I have slightly touched, in the place of discussing the verbs *āku* and *pōku*. There we had an occassion to realize the fact that the imperative form sometimes fails to show the real base of a verb, when the verbal form to be used in combination which a noun in 'viṉaittokai' comes to our rescue ; for, in such a combination the pure and uncorrupted verbal root alone ought to be used by rule. This rule does not appear to have any exception. On the contrary in the imperative what are called expletives like *miyā*, *ika*, etc., may be compounded with the verbal themes. Moreover the imperative forms are occasionally mixed with the auxiliaries. Thus the purity of the verbal root used as the first member of 'viṉaittokai' is sure to help us in identifying the original root of any doubtful verb. The following are the examples where varu and taru are used in viṉaittokai in their purest forms :— *'váru vicippuṉal'* (Tol. 1008) *'varu viruntu'* (Kural. 83) *'punal taru pacuṅkāy'* (Kuruntokai. 292). Further in another rule of Tolkāppiyam,

> "*tarucol varucol āyiru kiḷaviyum*
> *ta<u>n</u>mai mu<u>nn</u>ilai āyīr iṭatta*" (Tol. 512)

the words taru and varu used undoubtedly reveal their primitive nature and also their use even in the imperative singular, long before the age of Tolkāppiyam. I presume that this suttiram might have been taken by Tolkāppiyar from a grammar of his predecessors.

The above elaborate investigation will prove beyond doubt that *varu* and *taru* must be the real bases and that all the grammatical forms may be ultimately traced up to them.

3. *vē* (வே) '*to burn*' and *no* (நொ) '*to suffer.*'

		vē	*no*
1.	*Imperative singular*	*vē*	*no*
2.	*-do- plural*	*vēmi<u>n</u>*	*nōmi<u>n</u>*
3.	*Future Tense*	*vēvē<u>n</u>*	*nōvē<u>n</u>*
4.	*Present Tense*	*vēki<u>nr</u>ē<u>n</u>*	*nōki<u>nr</u>ē<u>n</u>*
5.	*Past Tense*	*ventē<u>n</u>*	*nontē<u>n</u>*
6.	*Infinitive*	*vēka*	*nōka*
7.	*Subjunctive*	*ventāl*	*nontāl*
		or	*or*
		vēki<u>n</u>	*nōki<u>n</u>*
8.	*Negative*	*vēkē<u>n</u>*	*nōkē<u>n</u>*
9.	*Verbal noun*	*vēkāmai*	*nōkāmai*

From these instances adduced here, we find the mode these two verbs adopt in conjugation is one and the same. Their grammatical forms also are alike. Yet they are

differentiated in the imperatives or crude forms - one being in the long vowel and the other in the short. My contention is that either the two verbs should possess short vowels or long ones, by virtue of being conjugated alike. To take either side, we are confronted with the rules laid by Tolkāppiyar and the later grammarians. If we were to take 've' as the crude root in similarity with 'no' the rules,

'e yeṉa varumuyir meyyīrākātu' (Tol. 71)
'ekaram meyyōtu ēlātu' (Nan. 108)

(short vowel *e* will not combine with consonant finally)

are against our supposition. Barring this idea, if we were to take the other side, i.e, *nō* as the crude root, corresponding to vē, because of the similarity we find in their conjugated forms, the rules

'ovvum aṟṟē navvalam kaṭaiyē' (Tol. 72)
'o navvōtu ām' (Non. 108)

(short vowel *o* will combine only consonant *n* in the final position)

would become faulty. How to reconcile this point of view with the considered opinions of renowned grammarians is a difficult task. In the next chapter with regard to the origin of 'ce' I am attempting to explain away this difficulty, on the assumption that the origin and disappearance of *ce* would have happened in between the periods of Tolkāppiyam and Naṉṉūl.

The absence of *no* in the whole Tamil literature, ancient, medieval and modern, except in two places in the commentaries *'no koṟṟā'* and *'no alaiyal niṉṉāṭṭai'* but the presence of *nō* in many places i.e., *'nōvēṉ nōval'* (Akam. 63), *'nō nontu'*

(Kural 157), *nōkkāṭu* and *nōvu*, and the use of *nō tiṟam* in 'viṉaittokai' all go to prove that *nō* should be the real base. Dr. Caldwell too supports this view.[5] If *nō* the long vowel form is to be accepted, we have every reason to believe that it was shortened in the preterites on the analogy of *cettāṉ* from *cā* 'to die' and *kaṇṭāṉ* from *kāṇ* 'to see'.

We may assume that in the days of Tolkāppiyar, *no* would be the root and all the grammatical forms sprung from it might have been *novvēṉ*, *nokēṉ*, *novval*, etc. the initial vowel being short. Pavaṇantiyār, following the rule (72) of Tolkāppiyam and also finding the example *no koṟṟā* and *no alaiyal* shown by the commentators who preceded him and whose commentaries he followed largely seems to have formulated the suttiram '*o navvōṭu ām*' (108).

From the foregoing explanation, it is hard to decide whether it is *no* or *nō* which was the original root; yet I am inclined to favour *nō* (நோ) the long vowel as the original root, as it has a close resemblance with the long vowel *vē*, which I have already taken as the unformed root.

முனைவர் இரா. செயபால் எம்.எ.பி.எச்.டி.
தமிழ்த் துறைத் தலைவர் (ஓய்வு)
அ. வீரைய வாண்டையார் நினைவு
திரு புட்பம் கல்லூரி (தன்னாட்சி)
பூண்டி, தஞ்சை மாவட்டம்

5. A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, p. 216.

5. THE LOSS OF OLD VERBAL ROOTS

Introduction to the changes in Tamil vocabulary:

Extinction of useless words, entry of new ones, changes of meanings in words like widening, restricting and shifting, together with the phonetic discrepencies, in the view of philologists, are the causes to the modification of the vocabulary of a language. Tolkāppiyar, the ancient Tamil grammarian has countenanced the disuse of old words and the rise of new ones and has given his sanction thereto in the suttiram,

'kaṭicol illaik kālattup paṭiṉē' (Tol. 934)

The commentators seem to have not fully realised the import of this section. Their interpretation is that no word can be rejected if it arises anew in course of time. This meaning is only a partial representation of the author's view. If Tolkāppiyar was aware, as he was, that new words will appear in course of time, he should have been equally aware that old words also will disappear in course of time. Rightly understanding the implication of the suttiram in question, Pavaṇantiyar has clearly pointed out that the disappearance of old words and the appearance of new ones will generally take place in a language in course of time,

"paḻaiyaṉa kaḻitalum putiyaṉa pukutalum
vaḻuvala kāla vakaiyi ṉāṉē" (Nan. 462)

The view can be sustained that the wording of Tol. 934 gives the twofold meanings, justifying the loss of old words and the appearance of new ones. It can be interpreted thus: One of the meanings is: no word can be safeguarded, if it drops out of usage. 'To die' is one among the several meanings *paṭu* (படு) has. *kaṭi* (கடி) will mean 'to defend' as Tolkāppiyaṉ has said *'kaṭiyeṉ kiḷavi, varaivē, kūrmai, kāppē'*. (Tol. 865). From these meanings which *paṭu* and *kaṭi* possess we may rightly interpret the suttiram "kaṭicol illaik kālattup paṭiṉē" as having the meaning 'none can save a word, when it does a natural death in course of time'. The second meaning is: 'no word can be suppressed, when time gives birth to it'. This interpretation is also emerging from the words *paṭu* and *kaṭi*, as they have the senses 'to rise' and 'to reject' respectively. Perāsiriyar, in his commentary on "marapē tāṉē, nāṟcol iyalāṉ yāppu vaḻippaṭṭaṉa" (Tol. 1337) has briefly shown with examples the disappearance and appearance of words together with the change of meanings, happening at all times.

The Tamil grammarians have actually but briefly mentioned in their texts the various changes that words suffer by constant use. The term *maruu* (மரூஉ) will suffice to justify the statement. Āṟumuka Nāvalar, a commentator on *Naṉṉūl* has said in passing that changes of letters in the use of words are of five kinds - addition, assimilation, elision, elongation and change of place.

A detailed and comparative study of the Tamil metrical dictionaries show the words added time after time and the change of meanings in all aspects. It is curious to find that some words have not as yet been incorporated in them. It is to be realised that nominal forms are generally dropping out of usage due to the social, religious and political reasons. Scarcely verbal forms lose their existence. This is the view

which we reasonably infer from the illustrations shown by the Western philologists as well as our own scholars. The latter have shown atōḷi, itōḷi, utōḷi, aḷan̲, puḷan̲ etc , as the examples of words gone into disuse.

The result of borrowing :

A few Tamil verbs seem to have gradually faded out of people's memory by the replacement of their Sanskrit or English equivalents. Such a kind of replacement serves no purpose and does not enrich the language. Otto Jesperson has made a brilliant remark about the nature of borrowing thus :

"In a great many cases linguistic borrowing must be considered a necessity, but this is not always so. When a nation has once got into the habit of borrowing words, people will very often use foreign words where it would have been perfectly possible to express their ideas by means of native speech-material, the reason for going out of one's language being in some cases the desire to be thought fashionable or refined through interlarding one's speech with foreign words, in others simply laziness as is very often the case when people are rendering thoughts they have heard or read in a foreign tongue".[1]

The commentators on Tolkāppiyam have hinted that borrowing words of any kind should not be regarded as an addition to the Tamil vocabulary and that they have no place in Tamil grammar (S. 62, 65 and 75 of Tolkāppiyam), But the rapid inroad of Sanskrit words into the Tamil language from the 6th century A. D. onwards, necessitated the later grammarians to frame rules regarding the adaptation of the borrowed words to the phonetic laws of Tamil and its grammatical principles. 'Paḷaiyan̲a kaḻittalum putiyan̲a

1. Otto Jesperson, Language, p. 210.

pukuttalum' seems to be the forced order of the day when the Sanskrit words were abundantly employed by the scholars. Thanks to the Tamil Puritans, the pure and necessary Tamil words have begun to recapture their former place in literature and in practice. As the scholars' view with regard to the treatment of the foreign words is such, in the following pages I am inclined strictly to confine myself to the Tamil words which have naturally dropped out of use or which have taken their origin from the sources suited to the Tamil language.

It was pointed out just a little earlier that verbs rarely become obsolete. But in Tamil we find a few instances which contradict the above view. On examination I am persuaded that these verbal roots except one or two have every right to live. This will be clearly borne out in the succeeding pages. The roots of some of the extinct verbs are not clearly perceptible so that I have a double duty in this chapter to say what the root was and to explain how it dropped out of memory.

1. Cettu, Cettaṉaṉ and Cettaṉaḷ.

What is the root of these forms? We do not find this root occurring in any other forms except in the past verbal participle and finite verb. The use of *'cettu'* abounds in the Sangam classics. But there seems to be only two instances in ancient Tamil literature as the use of the finite verb They are :

'vepputai āṭūu cettaṉaṉ' (Patiṟṟu. 86)

'kāṇunar iṉmaiyiṉ cettaṉaḷ pēṇi' (Akam. 16)

The root of these forms means 'to resemble' or 'to suppose'. No one has thought of what would be the root of these forms. May we for a moment think that *'cā'* can be the root of the forms *cettu, cettaṉaṉ* and *cettaṉaḷ* because of their similarity

with those which *'cā'* 'to die' takes in the past participle and finite verb. This supposition becomes unascertainable when we find that cā does not at all have the meaning 'to suppose' or 'to resemble. Nor do *cāva*, *cākiṉ* and *cāvāmal* the other grammatical forms possess that meaning. The resemblance of two different roots in a few forms will not be the best authenticity to prove that the root itself must be one and the same. There is no analogy in Tamil whereby it must be supposed that while a root has only one sense, its verbal forms through the tenses and persons will express two fold meanings. Someone may suggest that *cetu* (செது) may be the root of the forms in question. If *cetu* were the root, it would not have doubled itself in the past tense. Only the words preceded by a short vowel, with the ending of *ṭu*, *ṟu* or *ku*, will express the preterite by the reduplication of the final consonant : e.g., *viṭṭu*, *uṟṟu* and *pukku*. Moreover, there is no verbal root in Tamil which ends in tu, preceded by a short vowel. *'cetu'* is a corrupted form of *cetukku* 'to cut off. It is evident from its verbal noun '*cetukkai*' similar to '*patukkai*' the root of which is *patukku*, 'to hide' not *patu*.

It may be presumed that *ce* (*செ*) is a monosyllabic root. There are some arguments which stand in the way of holding 'ce' to be the root. Tamil grammars of all times have unanimously declared that there is no vowel - consonantal word with 'e' (எ) ending. Tolkāppiyam, a treatise on grammar which arose unequivocally before the Sangam Classics definitely asserts that,

"e yeṉa varum uyir meyyīṟu ākātu" (Tol. 71)

Naṉṉūl, a medieval grammar of 12th century, A. D. whose time is no doubt posterior to the Sangam Classics has reiterated the statement of Tolkāppiyam in the suttiram :

'ekaram meyyōṭu ēlātu' (Nan. 108)

If *ce* were in existence in the time of Tolkāppiyar, he would have certainly mentioned that one word was in *e* (எ) termination; for we find his mention of the existence of two words in *cu* ending and one word in *pu* ending:

'uccakāram irumoḻikku urittē' (Tol. 75)

'uppakāram oṉṟeṉa moḻipa' (do. 76)

We are therefore sure that *ce* in this sense had its origin only after his time. Really speaking, Pavaṇantiyar is expected to have said that *e* (எ) can be the ending of a vowel consonantal word, as he had certainly come across the expressions *cettu*, *cettaṉaṉ* and *cettaṉaḷ* quoted above (p. 51.) Probably he omitted in his grammar to mention them because such expressions were not to be found in medieval literature. Those expressions in question are only to be found in the Sangam classics. They have no place either in Tolkāppiyam, prior to the Sangam period, or in Tirukkuṟaḷ, Cilappatikāram, Maṇimēkalai, Peruṅkatai, etc., the literatures of the post - Sangam period. From the above explanation, it may be safely concluded that *ce* was a root which had its birth after the time of Tolkāppiyar, lived a prosperous life in the period of Sangam classics and fell into disuse before the time of Pavaṇantiyār.

ce like *o* 'to be like' takes the form *cettu* like *ottu*, in the preterite verbal participle and *cettaṉaṉ* like *ottaṉaṉ*, in the finite verb. It is interesting to inquire into the reason for the extinction of this root with its grammatical forms. *cā* (சா) meaning 'to die' which also takes the similar forms like *cettu* and *cettaṉaṉ* would be an important factor to oust the root *ce* out of usage. No religious, political or social motive is to be attributed as the reason for the obsolescence of the root *ce* meaning to resemble or to suppose. The psychological factor looms large in making it obsolete. In course of time the poets seem to become averse to using *cettu* and *cettaṉaṉ* as such

sound would certainly produce dangerous meaning and wound the feelings of the people. We find an analogy in *māṇṭa* (மாண்ட) the relative participle which was abundantly used in the ancient literature in the sense 'good' and which came in the later period to be solely used in the sense 'dead' though the root (māṇ or māḷ) is different in either case. *cēttu* is wrongly mentioned as an article denoting comparison in all the Tamil Dictionaries. Probably it is a mistake for *cettu*. Perāsiriyar, however, has rightly mentioned, *cettu* as a particle of comparison under the suttiram 1231 of Tolkāppiyam. The proper position of *ce* in *cettu*, *cettaṉaṉ* and *cettaṉaḷ* is that it is a root meaning 'to resemble', as I have indicated above.

2. *Civaṇ 'to join'* (சிவண்)

This root occurs in several places throughout Tolkāppiyam. On the contrary, no single use is to be found in the Eight Collections except Akanāṉūṟu, Ten Idyls, Tirukkuṟaḷ, Cilappatikāram and Maṇimēkalai. In Akanāṉūṟu, one of the Eight Collections, *civaṇa* has a rare usage in,

'*maṇipurai cevvāy mārpakam civaṇa*' (Akam. 66)

The author of the poem is Cellūrkkōcikaṉ kaṇṇaṉār. He has given no other poem than this. Since Kapilar, Paraṇar, Nakkīrar, Māmūlaṉār, Kallāṭar, etc., whose contributions to the Sangam classics are many, seem to have certainly not used *civaṇ* in the whole of their compositions and since Cellūrkkōcikaṉār, the author of only one poem has used it, I suppose that he might have been a contemporary of Tolkāppiyar or at least a poet who lived before all other authors of the Sangam classics. The author of Peruṅkatai has revived the use of 'civaṇ' which was a rare usage in the Sangam literature,

'*icaiyoṭu civaṇiya yāḻ*' (Kātai. 32.)

It is nothing but an adaptation of 'icaiyoṭu civaṇiya narampiṉ maṟaiya' of Tol. 33. Tiruttakkatēvar too has employed this verb in two places. Therefore we may say that the verb *civaṇ* had its rebirth after a long interval. Yet it seems that it again fell into disuse. It is curious to find that the root *civaṇ* which had a favourite use in the grammar of Tolkāppiyam was not at all used in the later grammars.

3. *āṉ* - '*to cease*' (ஆன்)

'*āṉā ikai aṭupōr aṇṇal*' (Puram. 42)

'*āṉātu uruvum pukaḻum āki*' (do. 6)

'*aṭṭu āṉāṉē kuricil*' (Patiṟṟu. 47)

The root of these forms *āṉā*, *āṉātu* and *āṉāṉē* must be, in my opinion *āṉ* the meaning of which is 'to cease'. The affirmative forms also are found in the Sangam classics:

'*āṉṟu avintu aṭaṅkiya koḷkai*' (Puram. 191)

'*aruvi āṉṟa peruvarai*' (Akam. 91)

These forms clearly show that *āṉ* must be taken as their root. We find the following explanations given to the two words *āṉāmai* and *āṉṟal* in the "Comprehensive Tamil and English Dictionary", by Rev. Miron Winslow.

> "āṉāmai - An abstract noun belonging to a kind of defective negative verb - that which is inseparable; not leaving; unceasing".

> "āṉṟal - An irregular defective noun".

The word 'defective' in the explanation should be particularly noted. What is the defect in these forms? Is there really any defect in them? As the root of them expresses the meaning 'to cease' there arises no doubt as to

its being a pure verb. It seems to me that as the compiler has not come across anywhere in Tamil literature the crude root *ā<u>n</u>* (ஆன்) he has dubbed them as 'defective'. The word *ā<u>n</u>* has several meanings. They are given in all the dictionaries. Among them, that it is a verbal root meaning 'to cease' is not to be found, because nobody dreamt of the existence of such a verbal root. They might have thought that the root of the forms *ā<u>n</u>āmai*, *ā<u>n</u>ṟāl*, *ā<u>n</u>ṟu*, etc., is untraceable solely because they found nowhere it has been used in the imperative.

It is natural to suppose at first sight why *āl* (ஆல்) may not be the root of the forms, *ā<u>n</u>ṟu*, *ā<u>n</u>ṟōḷ*, and *ā<u>n</u>ṟa* on the analogy of *cā<u>n</u>ṟu*, *cā<u>n</u>ṟōḷ* and *cā<u>n</u>ṟa*. One should not rush to decide only taking affirmative forms. If *āl* were the root, the negative forms would be *ālāmai*, *ālā*, and *ālātu*, in comparision with *calāmai*, *cālā* and *cālātu*. But the fact is that we find *ā<u>n</u>āmai*, *ā<u>n</u>ā*, and *ā<u>n</u>ātu* as negatives. Therefore *āl* cannot be taken as the root. Let us take another example to prove *ā<u>n</u>* must be the root. *ī<u>n</u>* (ஈன்) 'to bring forth' is identical in all aspects with *ā<u>n</u>*. It takes *ī<u>n</u>ṟu*, *ī<u>n</u>ṟāḷ* and *ī<u>n</u>ṟa*, as its affirmatives and *ī<u>n</u>āmai*, *ī<u>n</u>āta* and *ī<u>n</u>āmai* as its negatives. Therefore the comparison of *ā<u>n</u>* with *ī<u>n</u>* fully justifies the view than *ā<u>n</u>*, not *āl*, must be the root. In Tirukkuṟaḷ 'aruḷ ennum a<u>n</u>pī<u>n</u> kuḷavi' *ī<u>n</u>* is used in its crude form in the compound of vi<u>n</u>aittokai. But there is no single instance to show that 'ā<u>n</u>' is employed either in the imperative or in vi<u>n</u>aittokai. I am of opinion therefore that *ā<u>n</u>* 'to cease' has dropped out of usage in all these connections.

Why is not *ā<u>n</u>* used in its crude form? Why did it become obsolete? The reason lies in the predominant use of ā<u>n</u> as a poetic expletive or as a case sign or as a noun meaning a cow or bull. With a view to making the language less ambiguous, the scholars have omitted this usage in the crude form, retaining however, all other forms arising from it.

Thus *āṉ* the original root became obsolete. 'To cease' the meaning of the lost '*āṉ*' is generally expressed by *nīṅku* the other alternative verb which had existed more or less co-terminously with *āṉ*. Therefore this omission should be welcome to the lovers of a living language like Tamil.

4. *nūḻil* (நூழில்)

'Killing and heaping the killed' (koṉṟu kuvittal) is the meaning invariably given to *nūḻil* or *nūḻilāṭṭu* by all the commentators. Its use is very rare in poetry.

'*oḷvāḷ viciya nuḻil*' (Tol. 1017)
'*vēḷap palaṉattu nūḻilāṭṭu*' (Maturai. 257)
'*nūḻi lāṭṭi nukampaṭak kaṭantu*' (Malai. 87)
'*nūḻi lāṭṭiya cūḻkaḻal vēntaṉ*' (Cilampu. XXVI)

These are the forms we come across in literature. It is impossible to trace the original root of the word *nūḻil*. Two meanings killing and heaping seem to have combined in it. Doubt therefore arises whether *nūḻil* is one word or two words that are so much blended as if they were one. It seems to be a verbal noun like *kuṟil* and *neṭil*. After the elimination *il* the suffix of verbal noun, what remains is *ñuḻ* which should be regarded as the crude root. Tolkāppiyar has used only the form nūḻil as a verbal noun and that too in one place. In the literature prior to Tolkāppiyam 'ñuḻ' like ūḻ, tāḻ and vāḻ might have possessed other forms like *nūḻtta*, *nūḻttiya*, etc. But in the extant Tamil literature such combinations are not found. Instead of using *nūḻtti* and *nūḻttiya* in an ordinary way, the poets are accustomed to use nūḻilāṭṭi and nūḻilāṭṭiya with an auxiliary verb '*āṭu*'.

It is curious to mention that *āṭṭu* (ஆட்டு) another verbal noun is appended to *nūḻil* which is itself a verbal noun. The

double verbal nouns do not change the meaning in any respect. They serve only as examples for the people's laxity in the use of words through ignorance or misapprehension. Numerous examples are in Tamil like *nūḻilāṭṭu*. *kōḷ* is a verbal noun of *koḷ* 'to get', yet we say *kōṭpāṭu* or *kōṭal*. Thus nūḻ the crude root meaning 'to kill in heaps' became archaic probably before the days of the Sangam classics. This must be the reason, I think, for not forming the grammatical forms from *nūḻ* but from *nūḻilāṭṭu*. Nowadays even the forms *nūḻil* and *nūḻilāṭṭu* have gone to the same fate.

5. *e<u>n</u> 'to say'* (என்)

We find this root occurring in all grammatical combinations except in the second person singular of the imperative, like *e<u>n</u>pa, e<u>n</u><u>r</u>a<u>n</u>a<u>n</u>, e<u>n</u>pōy, e<u>n</u><u>r</u>u, e<u>n</u><u>r</u>a* and so on. Its use in its crude form is also found in the compound of Vi<u>n</u>aittokai.

'*yā e<u>n</u> ci<u>n</u>aimicai uraiyacaik kiḷavi*' (Tol. 34)
'*col e<u>n</u> eccam mu<u>n</u><u>n</u>um pi<u>n</u><u>n</u>um*' (do. 923)

It seems that on minute observation, we are fortunately able to discover that *e<u>n</u>* (என்) the crude root meaning 'to say' is also used in the second person singular of the imperative in Tirukku<u>r</u>aḷ, in certain contexts, though the commentators interpretation is different.

'*ka<u>r</u><u>r</u>ata<u>n</u>āl āya paya<u>n</u> e<u>n</u> kol*' (Kuṟaḷ. 2)

Here '*paya<u>n</u> e<u>n</u>*' may be interpreted as 'say the object of learning (payaṉaic col), the accusative case-sign 'ai' being understood.

'*illatu e<u>n</u> illavaḷ māṇpā<u>n</u>āl uḷḷatu e<u>n</u>*
illavaḷ māṇāk kaṭai' (Kuṟaḷ. 53)

Here illaten̲ and uḷḷaten̲ are to be interpreted as 'say what is not' and 'say what will be' the case-sign *ai* being understood in both places. The difference between the interrogative *en̲* and the verbal theme *en̲* is minute. It seems that the former might have taken its origin from the latter. Scholars, probably of the medieval period, with a view to avoiding collision with the interrogative *en̲* purposely guarded themselves against using the crude root *en̲* in the imperative mood but at the same time using all other forms sprung from it. When in this way *en̲* became archaic, *col* (சொல்) is largely used in its place. I am sure that this is the reason why the Tamil Dictionary has not given the meaning to say to *en̲* and has not mentioned *en̲* as a verb.

6. *Coli 'to remove'* (சொலி)

'paṭukaṭum kaḷiṟṟin varuttam coliya' (Akam. 8)
'puṟavin allal colliya kaṟaiyaṭi' (Puram. 39)

What is the root of these forms? Is it col or coli? The existence of the forms *colliya* and *coliya* in the same grammatical expression, like the verbal participle of the formula *ceya* does not throw light on the question of what the root may be. As such, we are driven to search for some other forms in literature.

'kāmpu colittan̲n̲a aṟuvai uḷīi' (Ciṟupāṇ. 236)
'tiṅkaḷ ukiriṟ colippatu pōl' (Cintāmaṇi 350)

colittu the verbal participle of the preterite tense and *colippatu* the participial noun clearly indicate that coli ought to be the root. If col were the root, these forms would be *colliyan̲n̲a* and *colliyatu*. There is also another point to confirm this. *Coli* is used as a noun which means bark of some trees. What is removed or barked Is called *coli*, *'kaḷaipaṭu coli'* (Puram. 383)

Therefore *colliya* occurring in certain places should be considered as a reduplication for euphony.

The root *coli* became obsolete when a Sanskrit word different in meaning 'to shine' but similar in sound superseded it and occupied a place not only in the colloquial but also in the poetic compositions.

In this chapter, it is desirable to mention two other obsolete words. They really belong to the category of uriccol; yet they deserve mention here as they take conjugation, according to the description of the nature of uriccol explained in the first chapter.

7. *eyyāmai* - *'ignorance'* (எய்யாமை)

Tolkāppiyar, in the chapter on 'uriyiyal' has framed a suttiram which runs thus :

'eyyāmaiyē aṟiyāmaiyē' (Tol. 824)

The negative form confuses us and leads us to doubt whether this form is capable of being used in the affirmative. This is the only word given in negative form by the author in the whole of that chapter. Ceṉāvaraiyar is of opinion that this form should not be held as negative as we do not come across in classics any affirmative form, like *eytal* or *eyttal* signifying 'knowing'. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, another commentator differing from his view, points out that *eyttal* is the affirmative form of *eyyāmai*, citing a line from *Civaka cintāmani* of the 10th century A. D. which has the commentary from his pen. It is to be noted here that the negative form alone has been invariably used from Tolkāppiyam down to Maṇimekalai. Peruṅkatai, a poetical composition anterior to Cintāmaṇi seems to have employed this word affirmatively for the first time,

'attolil nīrttena eyttanan' (Makata. 8)

Following this, Tiruttakka Dēvar has used it twice in the verbal affirmative participle in poems 2481 and 2683.

Naccinārkkiniyar states that Tolkāppiyar has used the negative form to indicate that negative forms should also be regarded as uriccol. If it were the author's view, it would have been wrong to mention it in reference to a particular word, as it will certainly lead the student to suppose that no other words except this will become negative. If Tolkāppiyar wished to convey this view, he would have laid down his intention in a separate suttiram as he had done in similar cases, like

"peyarencu kilaviyum vanaiyencu kilaviyum
etirmaruttu moliyinum porulnilai tiriyā" (Tol. 720)

I agree with Naccinārkkiniyar in this that it has affirmative forms but disagree with him in the point of reasoning. I infer from the fact that Tolkāppiyar has mentioned only the negative form of *ey* (எய்) that its use in the affirmatives fell into desuetude even before the days of the author. This is borne out from the Sangam classics where only negative forms are to be found.

'eyyā yāyinum uraippal tōli' Akam. 28)
'eyyātu ākinru eñcirucen nāvē' (Puram. 148)
'eyyā maiyalai nīyum varuntuti' (Kuriñci. 8)

Parimēlalakar, one of the most beloved Tamil scholars has unfortunately given a wrong meaning to the expression *eyyāmai* to be found in the following stanza,

"poyyāmai anna pukal illai eyyāmai
ellā aramun tarum" (Kural. 296)

Here *eyyāmai* is interpreted by him as 'without exertion'. It should mean, in my opinion, 'ignorance to utter a lie'. This interpretation in this context is in accordance with the meaning given by Tolkāppiyar.

From the foregoing explanation, it may be concluded that *ey* (எய்) with its affirmative use was virtually dead even in literature prior to Tolkāppiyam. The authors of Peruṅkatai and Cīvaka cintāmaṇi seem to have attempted to revive the old fashioned words in their poetical compositions; but the words thus revived seem to have been short-lived.

It is necessary to say why the affirmative forms should go into disuse. The word *ey* has several meanings. Its use, in the meanings 'to discharge an arrow' and 'to grow weary' is much favoured by the poets and the people. Nobody seems to have employed *ey* or *eymai* in the sense, 'knowing'. To mean that sense, aṟivu is much favoured. In the medieval period its use in the negative voice also was lost. Thus *eymai* and *eyyāmai*, the synonyms of *aṟivu* and *aṟiyāmai* ceased to exist. Breal remarks about the extinction of synonyms thus: "Now as the people is at once the depository and author of language, the fact that it denies the existence of synonyms actually brings about their speedy disappearance; either they are differentiated, or else one of the two terms ceases to exist"[2]. When the Tamilians could not understand the meaning of *eymai* and *eyyāmai*, they left them unused. The poets who sometimes avail themselves of the words which ceased to exist in daily use have also forgotten to use *ey* with its various forms, in the language of poetry.

8. *Paḻiccu 'to praise'* (பழிச்சு)

Its use abounds in Tolkāppiyam and in the Sangam classics where *paḻi* (பழி) as a verb has a lesser usage. From

2. Breal, Semantics, p. 28.

the days of Tirukkuṟaḷ, *paḷi* has been predominantly used in all grammatical forms. Though *paḻiccu* and *paḷi* have no connection with each other either in meaning or in root, there is a closer resemblance in the forms which they assume in the grammatical relation, like *paḻiccal, paḻicciya* and *paḻicci* from *paḻiccu*, and *paḻittal*, *paḻitta* and *paḻittu* from *paḻi*. *c* (ச) always evinces a tendency to change into *t* (த). *tolaiccu*, a predominant use in the ancient literature has in later days changed into *tolaittu*. When t has begun to replace *c*, the poets of the medieval period have really been afraid of using *paḻiccal* 'to praise' on the assumption that it will become equivalent to *paḻittal* 'to blame'. Thus *paḻiccu* and its forms completely became obsolete.

Tolkāppiyar has mentioned in two suttirams 907 and 908, *kaṇṭīr, koṇṭīr, ceṉṟatu, pōyiṟṟu, kēṭṭai, niṉṟai, kāttai* and *kaṇṭai* as the expletives of the second person. I consider them as the obsolete forms in the sense in which they were used in those days. The commentators themselves make mention of their disuse in their time.

6. THE RISE OF NEW VERBAL ROOTS

The statements of the grammarians as to what letters come at the beginning and at the end of words in their time are of great importance to know the history of the vocabulary of the Tamil language. It is to be remembered that initial letters show probably the newly introduced words whereas the finals show the change or extinction of old ones.

Tolkāppiyam, a treatise on grammar of the 2nd academy has definitely said *ca*, *cai* and *cau* (ச, சை, சௌ) will not come at the beginning of a word. The author has formulated thus because in his time he found no words beginning with such letters either in practice or in literature. Later grammars, like Vīracōḷiyam, Nēmiṉātham, Naṉṉūl, etc. finding the occurrence of words beginning with those letters have given the rule that *c* (ச) will combine with all the twelve vowels at the commencement of a word. If the literary records that existed before Tolkāppiyam were with us, we would certain'y be able to find what initial letters have been newly included in it. Unfortunately they have not come down to us.

The commentators of Tolkāppiyam have unanimously put forth the view that only Tamil words whether corrupted or newly arisen must be taken into account when considering the initial letters and that those works beginning with *cai* and *cau* should not be reckoned with, because of their Sanskrit origin (Tol. 62 and 65). No word beginning with *cai* or *cau* is to

be regarded as sprung from the source suitable to Tamil language. But they have concurred with the latter grammarians in the introduction of *ca* (ச) as initial because of its Tamil origin. Among the words beginning with *ca* we find a few Sanskrit verbs which are frequently used by the Tamilians: *caki* 'to endure'; *cạncari* 'to roam about'; *canti* 'to meet' *cantēki* 'to suspect'; *campāti* 'to procure; *cammati* 'to agree;' and *campavi* 'to happen'. These Sanskrit words are not necessary, as they can be easily dispensed with by their Tamil equivalents *poṟu*, *tiri*, *pār*, *aiyappatu*, *iṭṭu*, *iṇaṅku*, and *nikaḷ*. All other verbs with *ca* as their initial should be regarded as Tamil words because they seem to have sprung from the old materials. Firstly, I shall here produce a list of verbs beginning with *ca*, newly arisen after the age of Tolkāppiyar and explain their sources of origin.

1. *caṇṇu or caṇṇi* = to smear
2. *catir* = to gain strength
3. *camai* = to make or cook
4. *caḷi* = to be crushed down
5. *caṭai* = to check
6. *catai* = to crush
7. *cavaṭṭu or camaṭṭu* = to chew or to destroy
8. *cavaṅku* = to languish
9. *carai* = to become grey
10. *camaḷ* = to be ashamed
11. *caḷai* = to grow tired
12. *cali* = to be weary
13. *cavai* = to chew
14. *cavi* = to curse
15. *cappu* = to suck

16. *cari* = to fall on one side
17. *carukku* = to slip off
18. *calāttu* = to shake
19. *cavu* = to be cheap
20. *caḻaṅku* = to languish

It is to be held that the following onomatopoetic words arose only after the days of Tolkāppiyar.

1. *carēleṉal*
2. *carukkeṉal*
3. *calacaleṉal*
4. *caraṭṭeṉal*
5. *cavaccaveṉal*
6. *caḻakkeṉal*
7. *cappeṉal*

The philologists who have devoted much attention to the creation of new words express more or less an unanimous opinion that new words rise probably from the already existing materials so far as the cultivated languages are concerned. T. G. Tucker has made an observation regarding the new creation: "It is manifest that the possibilities of creating new words, and so enlarging the vocabulary, were practically unlimited. Such new creation has gone on at all times, and is proceeding everyday; but in the overwhelming majority of cases, it is simply creation out of old material"[1]. This view is amply borne out when we examine the sources of the new words mentioned above.

1. *ca from a*

A principle can be evolved from the following illustrations that *a* (அ) has a tendency to change into *ca* (ச) in the beginning of a word. For example *avai* 'assembly' changes into *capai* or *cavai*; *araṇ* 'protection' into caraṇ; *amar* 'war' into

1. Introduction to the Natural History of Language, p. 435.

camār and *amaiyam* 'time' into *camaiyam*. According to this tendency, the new words *caṉṉu, catir, camai and caḻi* may have taken their birth from the old words *aṉṉu, atir, amai* and *aḻi* without changes of meaning. Among these *camai* is to be noted. For the first time it has made its appearance in *cilapatikaram*.

'*muṭimutaṟ kalankaḷ camaippēṉ*' (Cilampu. XVI)

That *camai* is a corruption of *amai* will be obvious also from the fact that the commentator of Puṟapporuḷ Veṇpāmālai has given the meaning *camaintāṉ* to the word '*amaintāṉ*' in the poem 157.

2. *ca from ta*

It is a common occurrence that ta and ca will change place: examples are :- *kotuku* > *kosuku* 'mosquito' ; *vaittu* > *vacchu* 'to place' ; *taittāṉ* > *taccāṉ* 'to stitch' ; *mātam* > *mācam* 'month' etc; likewise, caṭai, catai, cavaṭṭu, cavaṅku and carai may be traceable from taṭai, tacai, tuvaṭṭu, tavaṅku and tirai. The history of the origin of *cavaṭṭu* is interesting. It is the first word beginning with *ca* (ச) that entered into the Sangam literature, after the days of Tolkāppiyam. The first poet who has taken the courage to newly introduce this word in his composition in contravention to the rule of Tolkāppiyam is Kaṭiyalūr Uruttiraṅ Kaṇṇaṉār.

'*pañcāyk kōraip palliṟ cavaṭṭi*' (Perumpāṇ 217)

cavaṭṭu being a form of piṟavinai its taṉvinai may be *cavaḷ* a corruption of tuvaḷ.

3. *ca from ka*

We have a number of instances to illustrate the change of *ka* into *ca* :- i. e. *kētam* > *cētam* 'loss' *kai* > *cey* 'to do' and

kivi > *cevi* 'ear'. In this way *caḷai* may be derived from kaḷai. We find the use of *camaḷppu* for the first time in Paripāṭal, in the line 'camaḷppu mukaṅ kāṇmiṉ' (XX Pari). In Peruṅkatai, its use is to be found as a finite verb like 'camaḷttaṉaṉ'. From the meaning atrributed to *camaḷ* 'to be ashamed', I think that it can be derivable from *kaviḻ* 'to bow'. As for the change of *v* in *kaviḻ* into *m* in *camaḻ*, the change of *uvaṭṭu* into *umaṭṭu* 'nausea' and *kuvi* into *kumi* 'to collect' may be quoted.

4. *ca from cu*

Cavai probably originated from *cuvai* 'taste' because '*u*' and '*a*' are readily interchangeable. Compare with *tuḷir* and *taḷir* 'bud' and *ulamaral* and *alamaral* 'confusion'

The words *cāpam* or *cāvam* meaning 'curse', *cavi* 'withered crop' and *cavam* 'corpse' seem to have given birth to *cavi* or *capi*, a verbal root 'to curse'. As a comparison, avi and āvi may be quoted here.

Words from onomatopoetic roots.

One of the theories regarding the genesis of the roots of human speech is called the onomatopoetic theory or the 'bow-wow' theory. By this we understand that words may be formed through the medium of imitation of natural sounds. Whitney remarks the importance of this theory thus: "Through all the stages of growth of language, absolutely new words are produced by this method more than by any other, or even almost exclusively".[2] I suppose that some of the words with ca as their inital, sprung after the days of Tolkappiyar, might have been formed in imitation of non-human sounds. Tamil vocabulary contains numerous words that have

2. Whitney, Language and the Study of Language, p. 429.

arisen in this way. The following words beginning with *ca* are formed by means of imitating the natural sounds:

> *cappu < cappeṉal; cari or carukku < carēleṉal;*
> *cali and calāttu < calacaleṉal; cāvu <*
> *cāvaccāveṉāl; calaṅku < calakkeṉal.*

As Tolkappiyar's rules relating to the initials are not compulsory and do not stand in the way of the origin of new Tamil words, it is shrewd not to find fault with those later scholars who have introduced in their campositions new words, on the false notion that they are in violation of the canons of Tolkāppiyam.

I shall here produce another list of words the origin of which is not traceable. The observation of T. G. Tucker in regard to the untraceable words, is apt to quote in this context :-"Apart from words which we know or believe to have begun in such slang, there does exist as Paul remarks, a large number of words, which can neither be referred to roots of the original language, nor yet proved to be borrowed from foreign tongues"[3]. The following new words in Tamil may serve to substantiate his view. Yet I have attempted to show to a certain extent the origin of a few verbs :

1. *katāi* = to talk much
2. *kaṇṭi* = to reprove
3. *kiṭai* = to be obtained - derivable from *kiṭa*
4. *kaḷal* = to become loose.
5. *koñcu* = to prattle - derivable from *kuñcu*
6. *kumpiṭu* = to worship
7. *kiṭṭu* = to approach

3. Introduction to the Natural History of Language, p. 438.

8. *tiruṭu* = to steal
9. *tuppu* = to spit
10. *takar* = to break to pieces
11. *tiṭṭu* = to abuse
12. *teṉpaṭu* = to appear
13. *turuvu* = to seek
14. *ciri* = to laugh
15. *cintu* = to spill
16. *cūmpu* = to shrink - derivable from *kūmpu*
17. *nakar* = to move
18. *pōtum* = to be enough

Some of these verbs might have been used by the common folk in the ancient day. But on the authority of Tolkāppiyam and the ancient literature where they are not found, we consider them as new. Some of the words in the list, like *kaḷal*, *tuppu*, *takar*, *cintu* and *nakar* are really found in the ancient clsssics where they are used not as verbs but as nouns with different meanings. There is only verbal resemblance between those nouns and these verbs.

I have hitherto explained how the Tamil vocabulary changes not only with the loss of old words but also with the increase of new words originating from the old material or from unknown sources. I shall here proceed to point out how the vocabulary is liable to change also by the words where nothing but change in sound alone is perceivable.

1. For instance, in the words *oḷir* and *oḷiṟu*, *muri* and *muṟi*, *kīral* and *kīṟal* and *citar* and *citaṟu*, the medial *r* and the rough *r* exist with no change in meaning.

2. piri and piṟi

'iṉtuṇaip piriyum maṭamai yōrē' (Akam. 43)

'piṟintivaṭ kātal vēṇṭi' (Akam. 55)

In Akanāṉūṟu (55), *piṟintu* with rough *r* is found in the sense *pirintu* 'separation'. I think that it is a serious mistake done by the copyist, in imitation of the previous word. The line runs as follows :-

'perumpiṟi tāki yāṅkup piṟintivaṉ'

On the analogy of the first foot 'perumpiṟitu' the copyist has made the last foot also to correspond to it. This mistake has come down to us through many centuries. Except in this place, nobody will accept such a usage. This is the reason why I am inclined to suspect it to be a mistake.

7. CHANGES OF MEANING

In the foregoing two chapters, I have dealt with the loss of old verbal roots and the rise of new ones. In this chapter, I am inclined to mention a few words which have changed their meanings, in the form of deterioration, restriction, expansion or transference. I have attempted to show the reason for the changes of meaning of a few words. Yet it is hard to discover a satisfactory reason. T. G. Tucker states that the "laws of meaning-change are not yet discovered and are probably undiscoverable".[1]

1. *Iṟa* - '*to die*'. (இற)

In Tolkāppiyam, in the Eight Collections and in the Ten Idyls, this verb is found to mean to go beyond, to pass by, or to trespass.

'*ciṟantatu payiṟṟal iṟantataṉ payaṉē*' (Tol. 1137)
'*kāṭiṟantaṉarē kātalar*' (Akam. 45)

Even the expressions '*iṟanta kālam*' (Tol. 725), and '*iṟantatu kāttal*' denote the meanings 'the time passed' and 'to assert once again what has already been said'. Nowhere before and during the period of Sangam classics, do we find *iṟa* in the meaning 'to die'. In the history of the Tamil literarure we come across a transitional period - a period between Eṭṭuttokai

1. Introduction to the Natural History of Language, p. 373.

and Pattuppāṭṭu on one side and Peruṅkatai, Cintāmaṇi etc., on the other. In the transitional stage Tirukkuṟaḷ, Cilappatikāram and Maṇimēkalai are to be placed. In all respects, they show the interregnum between the Sangam period and the medieval period. Among these three poetic compositions, Tirukkuṟaḷ seems to be the leading. In it *iṟa* is used in the sense 'to die' for the first time in the history of Tamil Language,

'iṟantār iṟantār aṉaiyar' (Kural. 310)

'vaiyattu iṟantārai eṇṇi' (Kural. 22)

Following it, the authors of Cilappatikaram and Manimekalai have used *iṟa* in the same sense in their works,

'iṉṟē allāl iṟantōr palarāl' (Cilampu. XIV)

'iṟantavar piṟattalum' (Mani. XVI)

The cause for its deterioration is very noteworthy. Antethesis is always expressed by analogous terms, to help the memory and to emphasize it. Vāḷ and tāḷ, pukal and ikal, aṟam and maṟam and icai and vacai are all antetheses. We see from these that words of opposite meaning have approximated in form. But *piṟa* 'to be born' and *cā* 'to die' though antethesis are not identical in form. It seems therefore that *piṟa* by analogy has chosen the word *iṟa* and that 'to die' the second meaning has probably taken its birth from the first meaning 'to trespass'. Nowadays *iṟa* has become a synonym with *cā*.

2. *cūḷ* (சூழ்)

'cūḻtalum ucāttuṇai nilaimaiyiṟ polimē' (Tol. 1071)

'eṉṉoṭum niṉṉoṭum cūḻātu' (Akam. 128)

In these instances *cūḷ* means 'to consider' or 'to consult'. After the Sangam period, it has degraded in its meaning and

used to express 'to plot' or 'to conspire. Its verbal noun *cūḻcci* apparently shows at present the meaning of conspiracy or plot. This meaning seems to have taken its birth from some of the couplets of Tirukkuṟaḷ where *cūḻ* is always associated with *kēṭu* 'destruction',

'*pōllata cūḻak keṭum*' (Kural. 176)

"*maṟantum piṟaṉkēṭu cūḻaṟka cūḻiṉ*
aṟañcūḻum cūḻntavaṉ kēṭu" (Kural. 204)

3. *vīcu* (வீசு)

vīcu in spite of its ancient meaning 'to throw' or 'to give' has acquired a meaning 'to diffuse bad smell'. Its use in poetry in this sense is rare; yet it is to be found as one among the meanings of 'vīcu' in the Tamil Lexicon. *vīcutal* '*nāṟutal*' become synonyms at present.

4. *vaḻaṅku* (வழங்கு)

To move or to be current seems to be its original meaning,

'*vaḻi vaḻaṅku mallalmā ñālam*' (Kural. 245)
'*munnīr vaḻaṅku nāvāy*' (Puṟam. 13)

It has acquired a new meaning 'to give liberally' even in the days of the Sangam Classics, but it was not then popular.

'*vaḻaṅkat tavāap peruvaḷaṉ eyti*' (Perumpāṇ. 26)

Nowadays, *vaḻaṅku* is predominantly used in this meaning only.

5. *tūṅku* (தூங்கு)

This verb is used in several meanings in the ancient classics, to hang, to swing, to remain or to delay. Now it is

exclusively used to express only one meaning and that too 'to sleep'.

'cōri ta<u>n</u> vāy varat tūṅkuvā<u>n</u>' (Kampa-Kumpa. 62)

When *tūṅku* shifts its meaning, its former place is taken by *toṅku* a corruption of *tūṅku*. But *tūkku* the piṟavi<u>n</u>ai of tūṅku still retains its former meaning. That *toṅku* is a corruption of tūṅku is evident from tūkku which is the piṟavi<u>n</u>ai form of both tūṅku and toṅku. The cause for the transference of meaning of tūṅku 'to sleep' seems to be attributable to the habit of sleeping in a swing.

6. *eṟi* (எறி)

'kaḷiṟu eṟi*ntu peyartal'* (Puram. 312)

In the Sangam Classics, its use in the meaning 'to hack' is alone to be found. Later days it is chiefly used to express 'to throw'.

7. The words *vāṅku*, *puri*, *pulampu*, *cōr*, *tolai* and *nampu* also have changed their meanings and are used nowadays to express 'to buy', 'to understand', 'to bewail', 'to become weary'. 'to destroy' and 'to believe' respectively.

8. *One word denoting opposite meanings*:

(a) *amai* (அமை) - 'to be existent' or to be 'non-existent'.

'uṟuppu amaintu ūrañca velpaṭai' (Kural. 761)

'aṇi amai tōṟṟatu aruntavam' (Mani. III)

(b) *paṭu* (படு) - 'to appear' or 'to disappear'.

'paṭuṅ katir amaiyam pārttu' (Cilampu. XIII)

Here *paṭu* is used in both senses.

(c) *nantu* (நந்து) - 'to prosper' or 'to perish'.

'nattampōl kēṭum' (Kural. 23)

'nantutoṟuu māṭṭa' (Mullai. 49)

(d) *varai* (வரை) - 'to make one's own' or 'to abandon'.

'veḷippaṭa varaital paṭāmai varaital' (Tol. 1085)

'mālvarai varaintaṉar emarē' (Puram. 151)

(e) *kaḷi* (களி) - 'to be abundant' or 'to become less'.

'kāmam mikka kaḷipaṭar kiḷavi'

'meṉṉōkki iṭaiyāyk kaḷintatu' (Tirukkovai. 61)

These words probably might have only one meaning in the beginning of their birth. That is almost amplified by the history of the ancient literature where some of these words have been used only in one meaning. The reason for the existence of two different ideas in the same expression is beyond our approach, as is evident from the general statement,

'moḷipporuḷ kāraṇam viḷippat toṉṟā' (Tol. 876)

made by Tolkāppiyar.

8. TANVINAI AND PIRAVINAI

It is at first desirable to remember that the English terms Intransitive, Transitive and Causative will in no way be appropriate to denote the classification which divides the entire Tamil verbs into two classes, namely *taṉviṉai* and *piṟaviṉai*. To use the English terms will certainly lead, as they have led my predecessors into error and will obscure the significance of the Tamil terms. Therefore, I am inclined to employ the Tamil terms *taṉviṉai* and *piṟaviṉai* throughout this thesis.

The classification of verbs:

There is a classification in Tamil which makes division of all verbs into two kinds by virtue of their capacity to take an object or not, i. e. ceyappaṭu poruḷ kuṉṟiyaviṉai (verb which never governs an accusative) and ceyappaṭuporuḷ kuṉṟāviṉai (verb which always governs an accusative). This classification is probably more ancient than that of taṉviṉai and piṟaviṉai and might have been a source from which the latter seems to have been evolved.

1. *Ceyappaṭuporuḷ kuṉṟiya viṉai*

No inferiority is to be attributed to this class of verbs solely because they do not govern objects. On the other hand, it seems that some of the verbs of this class might have taken their origin earlier than some of the verbs which govern

objects, because of their necessity in daily life. The verbs of this class are *naṭa* 'to walk', *vā* 'to come', *pō* 'to go', *iru* 'to sit', *ōṭu* 'to run', *paṭu* 'to sleep', *cel* 'to go', *vāḷ* 'to live', *tāḷ* 'to fall low', *aḻu* 'to weep', *uṟaṅku* 'to sleep', *tiruntu* 'to be repaired', *varuntu* 'to suffer' etc.

2. *ceyappaṭuporuḷ kuṉṟā viṉai* - (*a*) *The first subdivision.*

This class has two subdivisions. The first consists of the verbs, the objects which they govern having a title to be objects and objects only. The verbs of this subdivision are *uṇ* 'to eat', *kāṇ* 'to see', *cey* 'to do', *kaṭṭu* 'to bind', *aṭi* 'to beat', *kal* 'to study', *paṭi* 'to read', *eḻutu* 'to write', *tōṇṭu* 'to cull', *vaṇaṅku* 'to worship' etc. The suttiram 555 of Tolkappiyam beginning with 'kāppiṉ oppiṉ ūrtiyiṉ' enumerates only the verbs belonging to this first subdivision. The following sentences will bring out the nature of this subdivision:

nāṉ avaṉaik kaṭṭiṉēṉ	I tied him
nāṉ ataṉaik kāttēṉ	I saved it

Here *kaṭṭu* and *kā* necessarily govern the objects *avaṉai* and *ataṉai* respectively. Even though the objects may be in the form of nominatives, like,

avaṉ eṉṉāl kaṭṭappaṭṭāṉ	He was tied by me
atu eṉṉāl kākkappaṭṭatu	It was saved by me

they (*avaṉ* and *atu*) stand here in the sense of the accusative. It does not matter whether a particular case takes its own form or forms of other cases. Tamil grammarians seem to have insisted on the realisation of the sense it produces, befitting to the context. According to Teyvaccilaiyar, this is the view expressed by Tolkāppiyar in the following suttiram:

"yātan̲ urupin̲ kūr̲ir̲r̲ā yin̲um
poruḷcel maruṅkin̲ vēr̲r̲umai cārum" (Tol. 589)

b. *The second subdivision* :

This subdivision has similarity with the former as this requires also an object to govern: but has dissimilarity with it because the object which the verb of this second subdivision governs is not a real one. What characterises this class of verbs is that its object, notwithstanding that it is in the form of the accusative and takes the second case-sign *ai* (ஐ) really denotes the sense of the nominative, in accordance with the rule quoted above (Tol. 589)

The verbs of this second subdivision are of two kinds. The first kind consists of the verbs which have taken their origin from the major class of ceyappaṭu poruḷ kun̲r̲iya vin̲ai. Instances are *naṭattu*, *varuttu*, *pōkku*, *iruttu*, *ōṭṭu*, *paṭuttu*, *celuttu*, *vāḻttu*, *tāḻttu*, *tiruttu*, etc. The other kind comprises the verbs originating from the first subdivision of ceyappaṭu poruḷ kun̲r̲ā vin̲ai. Examples are *ūṭṭu*, *kāṭṭu*, *ceyvi*, *kar̲pi*, *vaṇakku*, *paṭipi* etc. The modes in which these verbs are converted into the second subdivision will be explained shortly.

The characteristic of this second subdivision is that the thing which is denoted by the object, notwithstanding that it is in the accusative form is a doer of action. The following sentences will throw light on the nature of verbs belonging to this subdivision:

pākan̲ yān̲aiyai naṭattin̲ān̲ 'Mahout rode (caused to walk) the elephant'

avan̲ pakaivan̲ai vaṇakkin̲ān̲ 'He subdued his enemy'

Here *yān̲ai* and *pakaivan̲* are really the doers of the actions *naṭa* and *vaṇaṅku*. Therefore it is obvious that each of the

verbs like *naṭattu* requires two subjects, one in the form of the nominative like *pākaṉ* and the other in the form of the accusative like *yāṉai*. Now the remarkable difference between these two sentences,

pākaṉ yāṉaiyai aṭittāṉ 'Mahout beat the elephant'

pākaṉ yāṉaiyai naṭattiṉāṉ Mahout caused to walk the elephant'

will be clear. In the first sentence, *aṭi*, being the verb of the first subdivision, *yāṉai* is really an object. In the second, *naṭattu*, being the verb of the second subdivision, *yāṉai* is really a subject but in the form of the accusative. It is therefore idiomatic to render the first sentence into *yāṉai pakaṉāl aṭipaṭṭatu* 'the elephant was beaten by the mahout' but unidiomatic to render the other into *yāṉai pākaṉāl naṭattap paṭṭatu* 'the elephant was made to walk by the mahout'

We find that the verbs originating from the first subdivision such as ūṭṭu, kāṭṭu, etc., sometimes govern two accusatives, that of the person and that of the object.

'tāi piḷḷaiyaic cōṟṟai ūṭṭiṉāḷ'. 'mother fed rice to the child'. Nowadays we shall prefer to say, *tāi piḷḷaikkuc cōṟṟai ūṭṭiṉāḷ*'. Here *ūṭṭu* which requires two subjects, as explained above, has one in the nominative form in *tāy*, and the other, in the form of the dative in *piḷḷaikku*.

The difference between the first kind of verbs *naṭattu*, *pōkku*, etc., and the second kind *ūṭṭu*, *kāṭṭu*, etc. lies in this that the latter has the possibility of governing two accusatives or two cases, the accusative and the dative as illustrated above. Yet there is no difference between them in requiring two subjects, one in the nominative form and the other in any other forms, because of their inclusion into this sub-division.

The explanation of Tanvinai and Piravinai :

Having given a preliminary explanation of the classification of ceyappaṭu poruḷ kuṉṟiya viṉai and ceyappaṭu poruḷ kuṉṟā viṉai, with the two sub-divisions of the latter, let us now turn our attention to the significance of taṉviṉai and piṟaviṉai. It is now easy to point out the contents of these two categories. Taṉviṉai consists of the verbs of ceyappaṭu poruḷ kuṉṟiya viṉai such as *naṭa*, *vā*, *pō*, *etc.*, and the first subdivision of ceyappaṭu poruḷ kuṉṟā viṉai such as *uṇ*, *kāṇ cey*, etc. Piṟaviṉai consists of the verbs of the second subdivision of ceyappaṭu poruḷ kuṉṟā viṉai such as *naṭattu*, *pōkku*, *ūṭṭu*, *kāṭṭu*, etc.

What is the definition of taṉviṉai and piṟaviṉai? What are the meanings denoted by the epithets *taṉ* and *piṟa*? Is piṟaviṉai entirely opposite to taṉviṉai like Uyartiṇai and Ahṟiṇai and Vēṟṟumai and Alvaḷi? These are the questions which deserve our careful explanation. The action denoted by the verbal root such as *naṭa*, *vā*, *aṭi*, etc., is called 'taṉviṉai' and the doer of such an action is styled as *taṉ*. The action denoted by the verb modified by the internal change like *kūṭṭu* and *urukku*, or by the external appendix like *uruṭṭu* and *ceyvi* is called piṟaviṉai and the doer of such an action is styled as *piṟa*. Thus it is clear that piṟaviṉai is not an opposite category of taṉviṉai but a category which has included the verbal root of taṉviṉai too. It is also clear that piṟaviṉai is in need of two subjects, one for itself and one for the included verbal root. For example, *naṭattu* is a form of piṟaviṉai and *naṭa* the first verbal theme is the form of 'taṉviṉai'. Therefore two subjects are necessary, one for naṭattu and one for naṭa.

Modes of forming piravinai :

We shall now enter upon the modes in which verbs of taṉviṉai are converted into those of piṟaviṉai. A considerable

number of verbs naturally stand both for ta<u>n</u>vi<u>n</u>ai and piṟavi<u>n</u>ai without any change in form. This is one of the peculiarities of the Tamil verbs. Tolkāppiyar has instanced a common root in *tapu* in the suttiram,

'uppa kāram o<u>n</u>ṟe<u>n</u>a moḻipa
iruvayi<u>n</u> nilaiyum poruṭṭu ākummē' (Tol. 76)

All the commentators have written the expression 'ita<u>n</u>ai māṟuka' when explaining the change of the order of words in poetry. This clearly shows that *māṟu* is a common form both for ta<u>n</u>vi<u>n</u>ai and piṟavi<u>n</u>ai. A lot of verbs, *cēr, tōy, veḷu, karai, teḷi,* etc., belong to this class.[1]

1. The verbal themes of ta<u>n</u>vi<u>n</u>ai become piṟavi<u>n</u>ai by means of doubling the last consonant. This rule is mostly applicable only to the verbs which terminate in shortened u of Neṭiṟṟoṭaṟk-kuṟṟiyalukaram and 'Uyirttoṭaṟk-kuṟṟiyalukaram', i.e., pōku>pōkku and peruku>perukku.

2. Another means to change ta<u>n</u>vi<u>n</u>ai into piṟavi<u>n</u>ai is to convert the nasals into surds. This rule is largely applicable to the verbs which belong to the class of 'Mentoṭaṟk-kuṟṟiyalukaram': e.g., *vaṇaṅku>vaṇakku* and *varuntu>varuttu*.

3. A third mode of converting ta<u>n</u>vi<u>n</u>ai into piṟavi<u>n</u>ai consists of appending a particle *tu* to a verbal root terminating in any one of these consonants ḷ, ṇ, l, ḻ, and r like *uruṭṭu, kāṭṭu, vāḻttu, cuḻaṟṟu* and *amarttu*, or in any one of the vowels *a* and *u* like *kaṭattu* and *uṭuttu*

4. Sometimes *cu* is added to the verbal roots with *y* ending. e.g., *kāyccu* and *pāyccu*.

---

1. Swaminata Desikar, Ilakkanakkottu. S. 66.
முடி, மடி, கெடு, தேய். தபு, பிறி இவற்றுட் பொதுக்காண்க.

These are the modes in which most of the verbs or taṉviṉai become piṟaviṉai. Yet there is a large portion of verbs which fail to conform to the above modes. We are therefore of necessity compelled to have recourse to other means for the conversion of this large portion of verbs into piṟaviṉai.

1. *A peculiar way :*

A peculiar way in which the rest of the verbs become piṟaviṉai consists of adding *ī* (ஈ) a verb to a verbal noun to express the sense of piṟaviṉai. *ī* seems to have been shortened into *i* (இ) by long usage. By this process, *kaṟpi, ceyvi, peyvi, kēṭpi, koḷvi, velvi,* etc., are formed. tt should be remembered that the definition of piṟaviṉai, i. e., It requires two subjects, is applicable to this kind of formation too. *kaṟpi* and *ceyvi* should be split into kaṟpu+i, not kal+pi, and ceyvu+i, not cey+vi. *i* is really a corruption of long *ī*. It has lost its original meaning 'to give' but generally denotes the meaning 'to do'. Dr. Caldwell remarks about the origin of the Dravidian causal particle *ī* thus : "The Dravidian causal particle 'i' may be supposed to have been derived from ī 'to give'. This ī is short in various portions of the Telugu verb........................ The meaning of 'give' is tolerably suitable for a causal particle" [2]. He fully gives also his consent to the view that the first part of kaṟpi is a verbal noun Therefore *kaṟpi* means 'make him do the learning' (kaṟṟalai cey). Two subjects are necessary because it includes two verbs, *kal* and *i*.

One may raise a voice in holding ceyvu, peyvu, kēṭpu, koḷvu and velvu as verbal nouns in the piṟaviṉai verbs of ceyvi, peyvi, kēṭpi, koḷvi and velvi. This objection may be easily set aside, for since we find that a verbal root like *varu*

2. A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, p. 462.

takes many suffixes of verbal noun in *varutal*, *varukai*, *varavu*, and *varal* and since a suffix of verbal noun is added to many verbal roots like *naṭakkai*, *yākkai*, *uṭukkai*, *kaṟkai*, *vēṭkai* and *vāḷkkai*, it is clear that there is no rule which regulates the modes in which verbal roots are converted into verbal nouns. In this connection it should be remembered that the easy way of splitting the oft-quoted examples celvuḷi and cārvuḷi is to divide them into celvu+uḷi and cārvu+uḷi, not cel+v+uḷi and cār+v+uḷi, as usually done by the commentators.

It is not an innovation that *i* is added to the verbal noun. It is as old as the modes mentioned above. Some scholars have suggested the view that adding *i* or in their opinion *vi* or *pi* to form piṟaviṉai is an introduction only from the days of Tirukkuṟaḷ. But this kind of formation is found in all the existing Tamil literature.

Examples are :—

'*amma kēṭpikkum*' (Tol. 760)

'*aṟivippēm kollō*' (Akam. 52)

'*piṟappittōr ilai*' (Pari. 3)

2. *A Second peculiar way*:

Another way in which the verbs of taṉviṉai change into piṟaviṉai consists of adding long *ī* (ஈ) to the crude verbal base. In this combination *ī* is always in its original form and the part to which it is added, is the radical verbal root and not to the verbal noun. The verbs of piṟaviṉai formed in this way are *velīi*, *uṭīi*, *taḷīi*, *tarīi*, *uṇīi*, *koḷīi* etc. The short *i* (இ) standing by the side of ī is not the sign showing the elongation of ī but a suffix of the verbal participle and is written in this character (இ) so that the completion of a foot may be effected.

Overlapping :

I have mentioned that the formation of adding i to the verbal noun occurs only in those verbs of taṉviṉai which are remaining out of the regular modes shown at p. 83. But we find that a remarkable number of verbs which can be converted into piṟaviṉai by means of the regular modes are also formed by the addition of the shortened *i* to the verbal noun. For example, *uṇ*, *kāṇ*, *vāḻ* and *naṭa* take the forms of piṟaviṉai like *uṇpi*, *kāṇpi*, *vāḻvi* and *naṭappi*, instead of the regular forms *ūṭṭu*, *kāṭṭu*, *vāḻttu* and *naṭattu*.

The medieval period of the History of the Tamil Language evinces a great tendency towards simplifying and systematising grammatical forms through the force of analogy. This tendency is felt in many phenomena. The systematic addition of the personal signs such as *aṉ*, *aḷ*, etc., to form finite verbs, holding *āniṉṟu*, *kiṉṟu* and *kiṟu* as the present tense infixes, *p* and *v* as the future tense signs, and *pi* and *vi* as particles of piṟaviṉai, adding *kaḷ* to the suffix of the epicene plural *ar* on the assumption that kaḷ alone is the particles of pluralisation and making the form of the negative relative participle similar to that of the affirmative relative participle, like *vārāta*, *ceyyāta* etc., are all attributable to the inclination of the medieval period which favours uniformity at the expense of varieties. Such a tendency seems to have been at work in forming *uṇpi* and *kāṇpi* instead of *ūṭṭu* and *kāṭṭu*. What is more we find is that the operation of the force of analogy has gone to such an extremity as to add *vi* or *pi* even to the verbs of piṟaviṉai under the wrong notion that *vi* or *pi* alone has the capacity to denote the sense of piṟaviṉai. That the inclination to make everything analogous characterises the medieval history of the Tamil Language will be evident by a poem of 7th century A. D. by Saint Tirunāvukkarasar.

āṭṭuvittāl āroruvar āṭā tārē;
aṭakkuvittāl āroruvar aṭaṅkā tārē;
ōṭṭuvittāl āroruvar ōṭā tārē;
urukuvittāl āroruvar urukā tārē;
pāṭṭuvittāl āroruvar pāṭā tārē;
paṇivittāḻ āroruvar paṇiyā tārē;
kāṭṭuvittāl āroruvar kāṇā tārē
kāṇpārār kaṇṇutalāyk kāṭṭāk kālē.

The argument that āṭṭuvittāl, aṭakkuvittāl, ōttuvittāl etc., are double casuals becomes untenable; for, if there were so, the succeeding verbs ought to be āṭṭātārē, aṭakkātārē and ōṭṭātārē. Therefore it stands to reason to hold that they are not double causals. Moreover the existence of double causals either in poetry or in practice is doubtful and seems to be wholly unnecessary.

Objection to Dr. Caldwell's view :

The explanation and the examples adduced in regard to taṉviṉai and piṟaviṉai will disprove the statements of Dr. Caldwell that "the taṉviṉai or intransitive verbs are all necessarily, as well as formerly. intransitives",[3] that there is a class of Dravidian verbs which are distinctly causal and which are formed by annexing to the transitive theme of a causal particle and that "Tamil idiom and the analogy of the other dialects require that causals should be formed, not from neuter or intransitive verbs but from transitives alone".[4]

Dr. Caldwell does not consider the following as piṟaviṉai, simply because they have no *vi* or *pi* in the end :- *perukku,*

3. Ibid., p. 449.
4. Ibid., p 456.

pōkku, aṭakku, tiruttu, nirappu, paṭuttu, tāḻttu, cuḻaṟṟu, mīṭṭu, vāṭṭu, ōṭṭu, tīṭṭu, and *māṟṟu*. The source of his many errors is to be found in his view that ēvalviṉai (verbs of command) is a separate existence other than taṉviṉai and piṟaviṉai and that the addition of *vi* or its hardened sign *bi* or *ppi* alone can convert the verbs into causals. It should be remembered that ēvalviṉai is not a classification at all, because all verbs will become ēvalviṉai and that it is a finite verb of the second person singular. I have already mentioned that there are four modes in which the verbs of taṉviṉai can be converted into piṟaviṉai and that the combination of *i* with the verbal noun is specially constructed to change the rest of the verbs to which the above modes are inapplicable, into piṟavinai. Therefore Dr. Caldwell's view that the sense of piṟaviṉai can be produced by vi alone is not acceptable.

The three examples *pō*, *aṉuppu* and *aṉuppuvi* shown by him to illustrate the significations of the intransitive, the transitive and the causal verbs lead to confusion; for *aṉuppu* and *anuppuvi*, being Sanskrit words, are not suitable to express the Tamil grammatical terms and they both can be expressed by one Tamil word 'pōkku'. In dealing with these subjects, he seems to have been carried away rather by the use of causal particle *vi* than by the sense of taṉviṉai and piṟaviṉai. The suttiram found in Naṉṉūl,

'ceyyeṉ viṉaivaḻi vippi taṉivarir
ceyviyeṉ ēval iṇaiyiṉ īrēval' (Nan. 138)

is supposed to have misled him.

The Colloquial way of forming taṉviṉai into piṟaviṉai :

Colloquially, a large number of verbs are converted into piṟaviṉai by the periphrastic way,; i.e., by annexing a word

signifying to make, to let or to put, to the infinitive of the principal verb. Examples are *kāṇac cey* for *kāṭṭu*; *pōkaviṭu* for *pōkku* and *vāḻa vai* for *vāḻvi.*

I have shown hitherto how the roots of taṉviṉai may be changed into the roots of piṟaviṉai, by internal alteration in the root itself or by appending of some particles or *i* the auxiliary verb. I have also shown how Dr. Caldwell seems to have erred in certain points in regard to taṉviṉai and piṟaviṉai. In all the modes referred to above, we can clearly see the importance of the hard consonant which is the chief factor in the transition of taṉviṉai into piṟaviṉai. It should be remembered how again the hard consonant is chiefly useful, as a particle of differentiation to distinguish taṉviṉai from piṟaviṉai, in the verbal combinations too. In most of the instances, the doubling of *tal,* the suffix of the verbal noun indicates the causative, if the verbal root is common to both taṉviṉai and piṟaviṉai; e. g., *piri, pirital, pirittal;* and *vaḷai, vaḷaital, vaḷaittal.* This is not the only effect that the consonant thus doubled produces. If the root is expressive of several meanings, the doubled consonant of the suffix of the verbal noun restricts it and ascribes to it only one meaning:- e.g., *tuṇi, tuṇital, tuṇittal* and *maṭi, maṭital, maṭittal.* Thus the doubling of the hard consonant serves two essential purposes: (1) distinguishing taṉviṉai from piṟaviṉai and (2) restricting the meanings of words.

9. 'Ī' (ஈ) - A TAṈVIṈAI VERB

In the chapter on 'The nature of verbal roots' mention has been made of the peculiar combination of ī (ஈ) a verb of taṉviṉai, with the verbal participle of the preterite tense, like *ceṉṟī*, *kēṭṭi*, etc. In the previous chapter I have shown how the taṉviṉai verb *ī* or its shortened form *i* is peculiarly added to the verbal noun like *kaṟpi*, *ceyvi*, or sometimes to the crude root like *veḷī*, *uṭī*. Thus the difference in construction between *ceṉṟī* and *kaṟpi* is clear. They differ not only in construction but also in meaning. *cenri* is a verb of taṉviṉai, meaning *cel* 'to go'. *kaṟpi* is a verb of piṟaviṉai meaning *kaṟkaccey* 'make him do the learning'. *ceṉṟī* is a predicate of one subject because the doer of *cei* and *ī* must be the same by rule, *ceṉṟu* being the verbal participle answering to the formula of *ceytu*. *karpi* is a predicate of two subjects, because the doers of *kal* and *i* are not the same, *kaṟpi*, being the form of piṟaviṉai, as explained above. Though *ceṉṟī* and *kaṟpi* differ in many particulars, they agree in this that they must be regarded as the verbal bases to which the signs of tense and person in turn should be added.

I shall avail myself of this opportunity to inquire into the following suttiram, in which tne function of *ī* is clearly pointed out by Tōlkappiyar.

> "*muṉṉilai muṉṉar īyum ēyum;*
> *annilai marapiṉ meyyūrntu varumē*" (Tol.933)

Pavaṇantiyār has also included this suttiram of Tolkāppiyam in his grammar The interpretation of this suttiram by all the commentators of Tolkāppiyam and Naṉṉūl seems to be wholly untenable. They have all taken it to mean that ī (ஈ) and ē (ஏ) with their appropriate consonants will occur in the end of the verb of the second person singular and have shown *ceṉṟī* and *niṉmē* as examples. They consider *ī* and *ē* as expletives and the consonants *k*. *ṭ*, *t*, *ṟ* and *m* in *pukkī*, *uṇṭī*, *uraittī*, *ceṉṟī*, and *niṉmē* as eḻuttuppēṟu - a term, the separate existence of which is unjustifiable. If *ī* and *ē* were really the expletives of the second person, Tolkāppiyyar might have certainly included them in the suttiram in 'Iṭaiyiyal':

> "*miyā yika mōmati ikuñciṉ eṉṉum*
> *āvayiṉ āṟum muṉṉilai acaiccol*" (Tol. 758)

None has shown the reason for the necessity of formulating a separate suttiram for these two expletives and that too in Eccaviyal. The mere saying that the consonants appearing in the above examples are 'eḻuttuppēṟu' the meaning of which is 'having a letter' throws no light on the structure of the Tamil verbs. The meaning of *cenrī* being *cel* 'to go' they are all inclined to discard all other elements *ṟ* and *ī* as mere show. In the chapter on 'The Nature of verbal roots' reference has been made to the light thrown on the compound nature of verbal roots by the use of the verb *ī*. *ī* is no doubt an auxiliary verb and is added to the verbal participle to effect the forms like *ceṉṟī*, *uṇṭī*, etc. The meanings of these words can be rendered into *cel* an *uṇ*. Yet minute observation reveals the slight difference between *ceṉṟī*, *uṇṭī* and *uraittī* on the one hand and *cel*, *uṇ* and *urai* on the other. The former are the verbs of request whilst the latter are the verbs of command.

The commentators seem to have erred in holding *um* in *īyum* and *ēyum* in S. 933. as the conjuctive particles. In

Tolkāppiyam, the following suttirams are placed one after another,

> *"ceyyāy eṉṉum muṉṉilai viṉaiccol*
> *ceyyeṉ kiḷavi ā kiṭaṉ uṭaittē".* (Tol. 932)
>
> *"muṉṉilai muṉṉar īyum ēyum;*
> *annilai marapiṉ meyyūrntu varumē"* (Tol. 933)

It is wrong to suppose *um* in *ēyum* as a numerical connective. Here *ēyum* is a finite verb of the paradigm *ceyyum. um* in *īyum* should be regarded as a particle connecting what has gone previously in S. 932 (iṟantatu taḻīiya yecca ummai). In view of the above explanation the meaning of the suttiram 'muṉṉilai muṉṉar' will be thus:— 'In addition to *ceyyāy* which yields the meaning of *cey*, the verb *ī* occurring in the finite verb of the second person will also yield the same meaning. But there is a difference between *āy* and *ī* with regard to their formation. *āy* will be directly added to the root like *ceyyāy*, whereas ī will make its appearance in combination with the appropriate consonant-probably with the final consonant of the verbal participle. Now it is obvious that the author of Naṉṉūl has committed a serious mistake in the inclusion of the suttiram 'muṉṉilai muṉṉar īyum' in his grammar separating it from the suttiram 'ceyyāy eṉṉum'; for these suttirams can make sense only when they are found in the order of Tolkāppiyam.

10. GENERAL REMARKS ON TENSES

The conception of three tenses :

It is an accepted fact that the Tamil grammarians and the commentators have agreed, however, in the conception of three tenses, in spite of the different views existing among the different schools of logicians. Just as in the concept of almost limitless space, there is introduced "Direction" east, west, north and south, so also in the concept of the infinititude of time, there is introduced "Tense" past, present and future. This demarcation simplifies understanding and has been in vogue in man's day-to-day affairs. Parimēlaḷakar, the commentator of Tirukkuṟaḷ has also expressed the same view in his commentary on 334:— "Kālam eṉṉum aruvapporuḷ ulakiyal naṭattaṟ poruṭṭu ātittan mutaliya aḷavaikaḷāl kūṟupaṭṭatāka vaḷaṅkap paṭuvatu". Though some scholars seem to divide "Time" as the Past and the Future, Tolkāppiyar, the best representative of the ancient Tamil grammarians divides it into the past, the present and the future and recognises their equal status, as is evident from the suttiram, '*kālan tāmē mūṉṟeṉa moḻipa*' (Tol. 683)

Terinilai and Kuṟippu :

The line 'kuṟippiṉum viṉaiyiṉum nerippaṭat tōṉṟi' (Tol. 685) is self-suggestive of the twofold classification according to their capacity to signify time, namely terinilai viṉai

(plain verb) and vi<u>n</u>ik kuṟippu (appellative verb). The epithets terinilai and kuṟippu disclose the facts that the former consists of declarative verbs and the latter consists of appellative verbs. As these are the meanings of these epithets, it naturally follows that tense - signs can be affixed only to the verbs of terinilai vi<u>n</u>ai and this class alone will express each of the three tenses conspicuously. Therefore, this and the succeeding chapters will deal with the class of terinilai vi<u>n</u>ai and the modes in which the idea of tenses is expressed in the verbs of the same class. This does not in any way mar that vi<u>n</u>aikuṟippu or appellative verb is expressive of time. That it comes under the definition of verb is easily understood, when we remember that the expression *kālakkiḷavi* is used by Tolkāppiyar to mean both terinilaivi<u>n</u>ai and kuṟippu and that the suttirams 697, 698, 704 and 705 are solely formulated by him to emphasise that *kuṟippu* will certainly denote time. He himself has admitted that time in kuṟippu exists but without variation of tense, in the line *mukkālamum kuṟippoṭum koḷḷum.* The reference with no particular time will not preclude *kurippu* from holding *vi<u>n</u>ai*, as the reference with no particular person will not stand in the way of accepting the optative or *viyaṅkōḷ vi<u>n</u>ai*, as the finite. It is therefore wrong to say that the appellative verbs never indicate tense. They have the idea of tense inherent in them, because of their capacity to denote a particular tense, when added to words denoting time like *nēṟṟu* 'yesterday', *i<u>n</u>ṟu* 'today' and *nāḷai* 'tomorrow'.

Tolkāppiyar's view on tense-sign :

Of all the subjects relating to the Tamil verb the most important but the most complicated is the means whereby the idea of time is expressed. The chief characteristic of the verb as defined by Tolkāppiyar and accepted by the later grammarians is the capacity to express time. Of the several elements which go to make up a finite verb, Tolkāppiyar has

taken only the pronominal terminations for consideration leaving the modifications that the verbal roots undergo, the infixes of tense, the insertion of euphonic particles and the changes that occur in the combination of several elements which constitute a finite verb, to be inferred. The authors of vīracōḻiyam and Naṉṉūl have treated some of them including the infixes of tense in detail. Though Tolkāppiyar has not treated all these, he has given his approval to split and explain the constitutents of a single word either noun or verb. Reference has been made to the line,

'palvēṟu ceytiyiṉ nūlneṟi piḻaiyātu
colvaraintu aṟiyap pirittaṉar kāṭṭal' (Tol. 945)

Therefore it is not worthwhile to find any fault with the later grammarians whose different views respecting the tense-infixes and the like give us clue to find out the nature of the component elements. Since the particle *um* in the line 'kuṟippoṭum koḷḷum meynnilai uṭaiya' (Tol. 684) suggests that there are also means to signify tense plainly, since the personal signs which denote tense in addition like *ku, ṭu, tu ṟu* and *kum, ṭum, tum ṟum* are enumerated distinctively from other suffixes which denote persons only in the suttirams 686 and 687 of Tolkāppiyam and above all, since reference has been definitely made in Tolkāppiyam to the existence of tense-signs in the line 'viṉai ceyal maruṅkiṉ kālamoṭu varunavum' (Tol. 734) there is no reason to doubt that Tolkāppiyar has knowledge of the existence of tense-infixes.

Mention must be made here in passing of the manner in which the concept of the past, the present and the future was brought out in ancient days. The preterite tense was expressed by a sign, probably *t* (த்) which was closely added to the verbal theme. The expression *iṟanta kālam* invariably found in Tolkāppiyam clearly shows the means by which the

preterite tense was formed and indicates that *uṇṭa* and *ceṉṟa* in which *ṭ* and *ṟ* exist are only the corruption of *t* by rule. The present tense was denoted by a terminal suffix, probably *um* which did not take any other suffix after it. The expression 'nikaḻum kālattuc ceyyumeṉ kiḷavi' (Tol. 711) unambiguously shows that it carries with it not only the sense of time but sometimes the person too. The future tense was effected not by any sign but by the mere formation of the verbal noun or the verbal root and the personal sign together. The fact there is no future sign will be explained in the succeeding chapters. I do not find myself in agreement with the view of Dr. Caldwell that the future is the least distinctive of the Dravidian tenses. It is used to denote what is, was or shall be habitually done and it is generally the connection alone which fixes it to a particular time'.[1] in my opinion the future alone is the least complicated and it is subject to minor change. The following pages will be devoted to bear evidence.

1. A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, p. 513.

11. THE FUTURE IMPLICIT IN THE ROOT

With regard to my statement in the previous chapter that the future is destitute of sign, I offer the following explanation. It is universally accepted by all the Dravidian philologists that the verbal themes are capable of expressing the imperative singular of the second person, by which we may hold that the verbal roots are capable of expressing the future without any sign for it. This idea is apparently hidden in the following suttiram of Tolkāppiyam which partially defines what a verb is:

> "*viṉaiyeṉap paṭuvatu veṟṟumai koḷḷātu*
> *niṉaiyuṅ kālaik kālamoṭu tōṉṟum*" (Tol. 682)

The expression, 'niṉaiyuṅ kālaik kālamoṭu tōṉṟum' may be taken to mean that a verb, on closer examination, will be found to indicate time by itself. In my opinion, the time indicated must probably be the future. This interpretation is not opposed to the nature of Tamil language when we remember that a noun, without any case-sign appears to be in the nominative, as is evident from the suttiram,

> '*eḻuvāi veṟṟumai peyartōṉṟu nilaiyē*' (Tol. 548)

As the noun in the nominative is destitute of any sign, so the verb in the future has no sign. Contrary to the above opinion of philologists, most of the Tamil scholars firmly hold that the verb is incapable of denoting the singular of the imperative by

itself and that the suffix *āy* (ஆய்) affixed enables it to that effect. The objection thus raised by them arrests our attention and deserves our careful consideration. The question is whether the verbal root denotes the imperative singular of the second person, with addition probably *āy* or without it. If the conclusion favours the latter supposition, i. e., no suffix is necessary for that purpose, it leads us to hold without discussion that the verbal root in itself has the capacity to express future tense and that the future tense has no sign for it. Because of the many advantages this result produces, the question ought to be dealt with in detail.

The interpretation of a Tolkāppiyar's suttiram:

Seṉāvaraiyar, the commentator of Collatikāram of Tolkappiyam[1] Swaminatha Decikar, the author of Ilakkaṇakkottu,[2] Subramaniya Dikshitar, the author of Pirayōkavivēkam,[3] Sivagnāṉa muṉivar, the commentator of Naṉṉūl[4] and a host of others, whose view with regard to the significance of the verb is that the verbal root will denote the imperative singular only with the addition of *āy*. They contend that once the root is restricted to the purpose of denoting the second person singular of the imperative, it is logically wrong to say that it will receive other kinds of suffixes too to express other tenses and persons. In support of their theory, they quote a suttiram of Tolkāppiyam, the meaning of which is controversial. It is therefore necessary to find out the real meaning of that suttiram to know the side which Tolkāppiyar took. That suttiram is,

> *'ceyyāy eṉṉum muṉṉilai viṉaiccol*
> *ceyyeṉ kiḷavi ākiṭaṉ uṭaittē'* (Tol. 932)

1. Tol. Col. S. 450.
2. Ilakkanakkottu, S. 66.
3. Pirayoka vivekam, S. 34.
4. Nannul, S. 137.

Ce<u>n</u>āvaraiyar has taken this to mean that ceyyāy is the verb of the second person singular of the imperative in the affirmative and that it sometimes becomes *cey* omitting the final suffix of *āy* but not losing its meaning. This interpretation is literally accepted by one school of Tamil grammarians. Is this meaning right? No doubt that Tolkāppiyar has mentioned *i*, *ai* and *āy* as the suffixes of the second person singular. Here *āy* has a regular usage in *varuvāy* in similarity with *varuvān* and *varuvēn* of the other persons. Its use does not here indicate any command. Sivagnāna munivar himself admits this distinction. The view that this suittiram in question refers to the form that the very word *ceyyāy* takes in certain places seems to be wholly wrong. It (932) actually deals with the meaning which *ceyyāy* yields in certain connections without change in form. The preceding and succeeding suttirams 926 to 931 and 933 will bear evidence to this fact. For example I will take one among them and illustrate this fact.

'*ī tā koṭu venak kiḷakku mūnrum*
iravin kiḷavi ākiṭan uṭaiya'. (Tol. 926)

Nobody will interpret this suttiram to mean that the forms of these words *ī*, *tā* and *koṭu* will change into the form of '*iravu*'. 'ceyyen kiḷavi ākiṭan uṭaittē' (932) has a closer resemblance to the line 'iravin kiḷavi ākiṭan uṭaiya' (926). Just as the three words ī, tā, and koṭu will be used to mean 'begging' so also the expression ceyyāy will be used to denote the meaning of cey. It is therefore clear that the expression *ceyyāy* will sometimes be shortened into *cey* is incorrect. What is correct is that the expression *ceyyāy* will occasionally yield the meaning of *cey*. If this supposition is acceptable then it is also to be agreeable that the meaning of *ceyyāy* must be different from that of *cey*. What are the meanings of *ceyyāy* and *cey?* If both words are taken to be in the affirmative,

there will be no difference in the meaning at all. There will be sense if *ceyyāy* is taken in the negative and *cey* in the affirmative. This is only the possible way to differentiate their meanings.

If we are to say that *ceyyāy* will sometimes omit the suffix *āy* and become *cey*, there are many objections to it. If that were so, Tolkāppiyar would have placed this suttiram (932) in Viṉaiyiyal, in the place where he has said that *āy* is a suffix of the second person singular, not in Eccaviyal. If that were so, we must perceive *ceyyāy* used in the affirmative in abundance and *cey* in rarity, in conformity with the rule 'ceyyeṉ kiḷavi ākiṭaṉ uṭaittē. The grammar of Tolkāppiyam and the whole of Sangam literature are a clear proof of their false interpretation. On the contrary and according to the meaning explained by me, the negative form *ceyyāy* yields the meaning of *cey* the affirmative only in few places, in accordance with the rule 'ceyyeṉ kiḷavi ākiṭaṉ uṭaittē'. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar a commentator of Tolkāppiyam has cited instances from the Sangam classics to prove this point.[5] The scholars who assert the view that *āy* should be added to the verbal root for the expression of the imperative have not given satisfactory reply to the question for the absence of the so-called imperative suffix *āy* in the ancient classics in the affirmative. They say that *āy* is elided in all places (puṇarntu keṭṭatu). In the whole text of Tolkāppiyam, we never come across any single instance where *āy* is used as as suffix of the imperative singular in the affirmative :

'*uraiyeṉat tōḻikku uraittaṟ kaṇṇum*' (Tol. 1057)

'*eṅkayarkku uraiyeṉa uraittaṟ kaṇṇum*' (Tol. 1092)

'*māṇalan tāveṉa vakuttaṟ kaṇṇum*' (Tol. 1094)

Is it a rarity in Tolkāppiyam, in accordance with the rule 'ceyyeṉ kiḷavi ākiṭaṉ uṭaittē'. The author of Naṉṉūl, rightly

5. Tol. Col. S. 450.

understanding the implication of the suttiram in question has expressed his view that the verbal root is in no need of any suffix to denote the imperative singular of the second person in the affirmative in the following suttirams,

'ceyyan ēval vinaip pakāp patamē' (Nan. 137)

"aiāy ikara irra mūnrum
ēvalin varūum ellā irravum
muppāl orumai munnilai moliyē" (Nan. 335)

There is another reason to prove that the verbal root itself will suffice to denote the imperative singular in the affirmative and nothing should be added to the root for that purpose. In a considerable number of places in the Sangam classics, we really find that the particles such as *miyā*, *ika*, *mō*, *mati*, *ikum*, and *cin* have been used with the verbal roots in the imperative. If the ancient grammarians held the view that the verbal root would express the idea of command only with the aid of a suffix, they would have certainly regarded the above particles, as the suffixes of the second person singular in the imperative. But the fact is that Tolkāppiyar, the best representative of the ancient grammarians has overlooked them as expletives, as is evident from the suttiram,

"miyāika mōmati ikuñcin ennum
āvayin ārum munnilai acaiccol" (Tol. 758)

He has overlooked them on the ground that the addition of any of them to the root does not change however the meaning already denoted by the verbal base itself. It is therefore to be remembered that *āy* which is to be found in the medieval classics as a suffix of the imperative singular in the affirmative should also be discarded as an expletive as in the case of *miyā*, *ika*, etc.

Tolkāppiyar is right in holding *miyā*, *ika* etc., as expletives, as his opinion seems to be that the verbal root is self-expressive of the command. But it is unjustifiable, on the part of the scholars whose view it is a particular sign should be attached to the verbal root for the purpose of expressing command, to hold such particles as mere expletives. It is significant to note that they discard the words *miyā*, etc., as expletives of the second person, eventhough they were used abundantly along with the verbal roots in the Sangam classics. Bat they advocate that *ay* is a suffix of the imperative singular in the affirmative inspite of the absence of such a usage in the Sangam classics.

From the above explanations, it is brought out that the verbal root stands also as the verb of command, requiring no particle for that significance. This fact suggests that the future is implicit in the verbal root because of its nature to be the verb of command also. There is also another point to prove that the verbal root is capable of expressing the future by itself.

The medieval grammarians have divided the relative participles into the past, the present and the future and have given the paradigms *ceyta*, *ceykiṉṟa* and *ceyyum*. They say that in an example like *kol kaḷiṟu*, *a* and *um*, the suffixes of the relative participles and the infixes of three tenses i. e. *koṉṟa*, *kolkiṉṟa* and *kollum* are understood. This view reveals that *um* is the sign of the future and it is understood in kol kaḷiṟu, like *t* and *kiṉṟu* of other tenses. Here is a great and remarkable difference between the medieval grammars on one side and Tolkāppiyam on the other. Tolkāppiyam is the ancient Tamil grammar, probably before the third century B C and it is superior to any other grammars in point of accuracy and in presenting the true nature and the growth of Tamil language. It helps in many respects to understand that the verbal root is self-expressive of the future tense.

Tolkāppiyar has clearly stated that there are only two relative participles, the past and the present as is evident from the following suttiram where only two paradigms are given,

> *"avvaṟu poruṭkumōr aṉṉa urimaiya*
> *ceyyum ceyta eṉṉuñ collē"* (Tol. 718)

In an example like *kol kaḷiṟu*, he thinks that only the present and past tenses are understood, as it is also evident from the suttiram,

> *"ceyyum ceyta eṉṉum kiḷaviyiṉ*
> *meyyoruṅku iyalum toḻiltoku moḻiyum"* (Tol. 482)

As there is no sign for the future and the verb itself has the capacity to signify that tense, it is reasonable to hold that the future is not understood but expressed in the compound of Viṉaittokai, like kolkaliru. That this is the view of Tolkāppiyar in holding only two relative participles will be apparent from the suttiram,

> *'viṉaiyiṉ tokuti kālattu iyalum'* (Tol. 897)

The statement that the compound (Viṉaiyiṉ tokuti) wherein the idea of the past and present tenses is understood, will denote time (kālattiyalum) clearly suggests that the remaining tense i. e., the future is expressed in that compound.

The foregoing explanations that the verbal root is capable of being used as the second person singular of the imperative, without a separate sign for that purpose and that the future is always expressed in the compound of 'Viṉaittokai' will prove the point that the characteristic of the Tamil verb is the capacity to express the future without any sign for it.

12. THE FORMATION OF THE FUTURE

For the sake of convenience, let us divide all verbs into two classes, viz., the first class of verbs and the second class of verbs. The first class consists of the verbs which have the endings in letters other than the shortened '*u*'. The verbs which end in the shortened '*u*' comprise the second class. That the latter class of verbs always demands a separate treatment is clear from the existence of 'kuṟṟiyalukarap-puṇariyal' (குற்றியலுகரப் புணரியல்) apart from 'uyiriṟṟup-puṇarial (உயிரீற்றுப் புணரியல்) in Tolkappiyam.

1. *The formation of the future tense of the first class of verbs*:

I have shown in the previous chapter the absense of any sign for the future in the verb of the second person singular of the imperative and in the first member of the componnd of Viṉaittokai. That fact holds good even in the other persons of the future tense. The forms of the first class of verbs which take in the future in relation to the first person singular, the masculine gender of the third person and the neuter plural are as follows :-

First person singular	Third person Masculine	Neutral plural
1. *naṭappēṉ*	*naṭappāṉ*	*naṭappa*
2. *naṭippēṉ*	*naṭippāṉ*	*naṭippa*

3. *viṭuvēṉ*	*viṭuvāṉ*	*viṭuva*
or	*or*	*or*
viṭuppēṉ	*viṭuppāṉ*	*viṭuppa*
4. *colvēṉ*	*colvāṉ*	*colva*
5. *koḷvēṉ*	*koḷvāṉ*	*koḷva*

These illustrations clearly show that *eṉ*, *āṉ*, and *a* are added not to verbal bases but to the verbal nouns. The verbal noun is a peculiar category which is so flexible as to be used for many purposes. That peculiarity lies in its possession of the double characteristics of verb and noun. In the chapter on 'Taṉviṉai and Piṟaviṉai' reference has been made to the manner in which the verbal nouns are employed in the formation of the piṟaviṉai verbs. Now we have the opportunity to find how the verbal nouns do their function in the formation of the future tense, with the addition of the pronominal terminations to them. The above examples clearly indicate that the combination of the verbal noun with the personal sign contributes to the idea of the future tense, requiring no element for that purpose. As the first part of the verbal noun being the verb, and as it has the capacity to express the future tense by itself, the absence of any future element in the above combination will not surprise us.

When the signs of persons are added direct to the verbal nouns, some minor change is noticeable; but that change does not, however, contradict the above suppostion that the future has no sign. *a* (அ) the suffix of the neuter plural is sometimes added not directly to the verbal noun, like *naṭappa* and *colva* but it is added to a particle aṉ which comes close to the verbal noun lika *naṭappaṉa* and *colvaṉa*. Tamil grammarians and philologists consider this *aṉ* as euphonically inserted in the middle. The form *naṭappa* may be taken to be the verb

of the neuter plural or to be the verb of the epicene plural. It is common to them, whatever may be the suffix in either case. But the form *naṭappaṉa* wherein *aṉ* is inserted leaves no ambiguity and belongs exclusively to the neuter plural. Therefore *aṉ* which comes in between the verbal noun and the suffix of the neuter plural should be regarded as a particle of differentiation. This supposition will be attested also by another point. The expressions *naṭanta* and *naṭavāniṉṟa* stand in common to the past and present relative participles and to the neuter plural of the past and present tenses. When *aṉ* is inserted, the forms *naṭantaṉa* and *naṭavāniṉṟaṉa* stand in particular to the neuter plural of the past and present tenses only. Thus *aṉ* as a particle of differentiation is obvious. Thls change is so insignificant as to contradict the above view that the combination of the verbal noun with the person-signs tends to the idea of the future. This change takes place in the verb of neuter plural only to do the function mentioned above. It has nothing to do with the time.

2. *The formation of the future tense of the second class of verbs*:

The second class of verbs *nāṭu*, 'to seek' *uruku* 'to melt' *aṇaṅku* 'to suffer' *varuttu* 'to afflict', etc , form their future by adding the signs of persons to the verbal roots themselves and not to the verbal nouns. As *u* (உ) is the natural ending of this class of verbs, it is hard to add further *pu*, *vu* or *u* the suffix of the verbal noun. The forms which they take in the future in relation to the first person singular, the masculine gender of the third person and the neuter plural are as follows :

First person	Masculine	Neuter plural
1. *nāṭuvēṉ*	*nāṭuvāṉ*	*nāṭuva*
2. *urukuvēṉ*	*urukuvān*	*urukuva*

3. *aṇaṅkuvēṉ* *aṇaṅkuvāṉ* *aṇaṅkuva*

4. *varuttuvēṉ* *varuttuvāṉ* *varuttuva*

In the above instances we find that the person-signs *ēṉ*, *āṉ* and *a* are added to the verbal roots to form the future and *v* (வ்) occurs in all places in the middle. What is the use and force of this *v*? It should not be regarded as an intervocalic letter, as there is no necessity to prevent hiatus between the shortened *u* and the vowel. By rule, the shortened *u* will disappear so that the succeeding vowel will combine with the preceding consonant. I am inclined to say that *v* in the above examples should be held as a particle of differentiation. *v* (வ்) is the seat of difference between the affirmative and the negative so far as the second class of verbs is concerned. The examples of the affirmative verbs are *nāṭuvēṉ* *nāṭuvāṉ*, and *nāṭuval* and the corresponding negative verbs are *nāṭēṉ*, *nāṭāṉ* and *nāṭal*. The commentators of Naṉṉūl are of opinion that *v* in the forms *ōtuvāṉ* a teacher, and *pāṭuvāṉ* a singer, is the particle of noun (peyar iṭainilai) and that v in *ōtuvāṉ* and *pāṭuvāṉ*, the finite verbs of the masculine gender of the third person is the sign of the future. I am of opinion that v in all these places is the particle of differentiation and that this particle distinguishes the above affirmative forms from their negatives like *ōtāṉ* and *pāṭāṉ*.

When the suffix of the neuter plural is combined with the verbal root of the second class, a similar change as shown above in regard to the verbs of the first class occurs. The suffix *a* (அ) is added to a particle *aṉ*, like *naṭappaṇa* and *uṇpaṉa*. 'aṉ' the particle of differentiation distinguishes the forms of the neuter plural from those of these epicene plural, like *naṭappa* and *uṇpa*.

The future verbal participles:

The initial consonants *v* (வ்) and *p* (ப்) of the suffixes of the future verbal participles *vāṉ*, *pāṉ* and *pākku* are not future

signs but are part and parcel of the verbal nouns. The examples *ceyvāṉ*, *uṇpāṉ* and *uṇpākku* are the combinations of ceyvu + āṉ ; uṇpu + āṉ ; and uṇpu + ākku. The first portions of them are really verbal nouns. It will suffice to note here that *āṉ* and *ku* the latter portions of these suffixes should be regarded as the instrumental and dative case-signs respectively. These case-signs, combined with the verbal nouns, do the function of the future verbal participles. From this, it is evident that the formation alone contributes to the expression of the future, requiring no element for it. It should be remembered here that among the nine verbal participles enumerated by Tolkāppiyar, *ceyaṟku* has the verbal noun as its base, like *ceyvāṉ*, *uṇpāṉ* and *uṇpākku* and it, combined with the dative sign *ku* expresses the idea of the future without any separate sign for that expression.

The future tense of the third person neuter singular:

Dr. Caldwell observes that whilst 'he will be' is *iruppāṉ*, 'it will be' is ordinary *irukkum*, not *iruppadu*, and forms like *iruppadu* are in general used only as participial nouns. In this respect Tamil is less regular than Canarese in which the ordinary third person neuter singular of the future tense is *iruvadu*".[1] In the days of Tolkāppiyam and the Sangam classics, *um* was used to denote the present tense, not certainly the future. The suttirams of Tolkāppiyam,

'*nikaḻūu niṉṟa palarvarai kiḷavi*' (Tol. 657)

"*pallōr paṭarkkai nuṉṉilai taṉmai*
avvayiṉ mūṉṟum nikaḻum kālattuc
ceyyum eṉṉum kiḷaviyoṭu kollā" (Tol. 711)

clearly point out that *ceyyum* is used as a verb of the present tense in the masculine and femine genders and the singular and

1. A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, p. 515.

plural of the neuter. In the medieval period *ceyyum* came to be used as a verb of the future tense in the third person singular neuter. The above statement of Dr. Caldwell holds good so far as the medieval literature is concerned. But when *ceyyum* was used as a verb of the present tense in the Sangam period, *ceyvāṉ*, *ceyvāḷ*, *ceyvatu* and *ceyvaṉa* might have been used as the verbs of the future in the masculine and feminine genders and the singular and plural of the neuter. As Dr. Caldwell admits of the existence of the ordinary future verbs in the masculine and feminine genders and the neuter plural, I need not cite examples from the Sangam classics. I am inclined to quote examples from the ancient classics to show that the future tense of the third person neuter singular, like other persons, was formed by the addition of the suffix *atu* to the verbal noun:

> '*teṉṉīrc ciṟukuḷam kīḷvatu mātō*' (Puram. 118)
>
> '*poruḷ piriyiṟ puṇarvaṭu*' (Akam. 51)
>
> "*iṉṟum varuvatu kollō nerunalum*
> *koṉṟatu pōlum nirappu*" (Kural. 1048)

Thus, the statement by Dr. Caldwell that there is no ordinary third person neuter singular of the future tense in Tamil as in Canarese is not acceptable.

From the foregoing explanations, it is brought out that the combination of the person-signs with the verbal nouns, in the case of the first class of verbs or with the verbal themes in the case of the second class of verbs contributes to the expression of the idea of the future. It is also brought out that v (வ்) and p (ப்) appearing in the future tense of the first class of verbs are part and parcel of the suffixes of the verbal noun and that v appearing in the future tense of the second class of verbs is the particle of differentiation. It is clear from this that there is no sign for the future in Tamil.

13. THE NEGATIVE VERB

I have explained in the previous chapter how the formation of the verbal noun or the verbal theme and the addition of the personal sign contributes to the expression of the future tense, without the need for any additional sign to indicate the future. I have fully satisfied myself by through investigation that the idea of negation is also effected by the combination of the verbal root with the personal sign, though the manner of combination is different in both cases. The negative forms of the *first class of verbs* through all persons are as follows :-

a. *Negative verbs of the First person singular and plural:*

	Singular		Plural
1.	*naṭavē<u>n</u>*	'to walk'	*naṭavēm* or *naṭavōm*
2.	*aṭiyē<u>n</u>*	'to beat'	*aṭiyēm* or *aṭiyōm*
3.	*ceyyē<u>n</u>*	'to do'	*ceyēm* or *ceyyo̱m*
4.	*vāḻē<u>n</u>*	'to live'	*vāḻēm* or *vāḻōm*

b. *Negative verbs of the Second person singular and plural :*

	Singular	Plural
1.	*naṭavāy*	*naṭavīr*
2.	*aṭiyāy*	*aṭiyīr*

3. *ceyyāy*	*ceyyīr*
4. *vāḻāy*	*vāḻīr*

c. *Negative verbs of the third person:*

	Masculine	Feminine	Epicene plural
1.	*naṭavāṉ*	*naṭavāḷ*	*naṭavār*
2.	*aṭiyāṉ*	*aṭiyāḷ*	*aṭiyār*
3.	*ceyyāṉ*	*ceyyāḷ*	*ceyyār*
4.	*vāḻāṉ*	*vāḻāḷ*	*vāḻār*

	Neuter singular	Neuter plural
1.	*naṭavātu*	*naṭavā*
2.	*aṭiyātu*	*aṭiyā*
3.	*ceyyātu*	*ceyyā*
4.	*vāḻātu*	*vāḻā*

In the affirmative formation of the future tense of the first class of verbs, the signs of personality are added directly to *the verbal nouns,* whereas in the negative formation of the first class of verbs those signs are added directly to *the verbal roots*, only with such insignificant changes as euphony requires. Those changes are the redoublicatlon of the final consonants like *uṇṇēṉ, ceyyēṉ,* etc., or the occurrence of *v* or *y* to prevent hiatus like *naṭavēṉ, aṭiyēṉ,* etc. In these places, the person-signs are added to the consonants thus redoubled or to the intervocalic letters thus inserted. In all other places, those signs are added direct to the verbal roots to express negation like *vaḻēṉ, viṭēṉ,* etc.

Since ē (ஏ) invariably occurs in the first person singular, ō (ஓ) in the first person plural and ā (ஆ) in other persons,

in the above examples and since Tolkāppiyar has said '*ā*, *ē*, *ō*, *ammūṉṟum viṉā*' (32), I am inclined at first to favour the theory of Dr. Gundert that the particles of interrogative are the means whereby the idea of negation is expressed, and that the meaning of a question reduces to the meaning of negation. But on minute scrutiny of the above examples and on the discovery of the absence of any future sign, I am inclined to propose a different view, i.e., the direct combination of the person-signs with the verbal root tends to the sense of negation. This is also the view of Beschi. He says that "It is peculiar to this language to have a mode, whereby, without any particle importing negation, they express the negative sense of every verb".[2]

The signs of the third person :

It is generally stated that the signs of the masculine and feminine genders, the epicene plural and the singular and plural of the neuter are aṉ and āṉ, aḷ and āḷ, ar and ār, tu and a and ā. The only thing which has no suffixes beginning with a and ā is the neuter singular. We find that the first and the second persons too possess the suffixes beginning with short and long vowels in eṉ and ēṉ, ai and āy, and ir and ir īr. Thus we are surprised to find that the neuter singular of the third person alone has not been favoured with the initial vowels. Is it true that 'tu' has not been preceded by any vowel? If the neuter singular were not really in possession of the suffixes like atu and ātu, this non-possession would betray the irregularity of the nature of the personal signs in the Tamil language. Atu and ātu, the singular signs of the genitive case and the expressions *mutalatu* (Tol. 65) *īṟu ākātu* (do. 71) lead us to suppose that the neuter singular too, like all other persons is in possession of suffixes beginning with short and long vowels like *atu* and *ātu*. As a proof of the

2. Beschi, Kodum Tamil, p. 56.

practice of omission of the initial vowels *a* and *ā* of the suffixes, I will adduce the following suttirams of Tolkappiyam where *ṉ*, *ḷ* and *r* alone are mentioned, with the elimination of their vowels.

'nahāṉ oṟṟē āṭūu aṟicoi' (Tol. 488)
'ḷahāṉ oṟṟē makaṭūu aṟicol' (Tol. 489)
'lahaṉ oṟṟum pakara iṟutiyum' (Tol. 490)

Thus we find that in the examples, *vāḷāṉ*, *vāḷāḷ*, *vāḷār*, *vāḷātu* and *vāḷā*, the suffixes of the third person are directly annexed to the verbal theme and that the direct annexation contributes to the expression of the idea of negation, in no need of any particle for that purpose. The long vowel *ā* regularly occurring in all these places has been wrongly taken as the particle of negation by the latter grammarians. They are unaware that *ā* (ஆ) is the first portion of the personal signs.

The latter grammarians who have had the least thought of the existence of the several modes and their peculiar functions they fulfil in the domain of Tamil Grammar, have had a tendency to find out a means in the shape of particles for every expression which a word could produce. This tendency rooted in them is the cause for their wrong splitting of several regular combinations so as to pronounce p (ப்) and v (வ்) as the future tense signs, *āniṉṟu*, *kiṉṟu* and *kiṟu* as the present tense-signs and *pi* and *vi* as the particles of piṟaviṉai. This is the tendency that seems to be at work in the say that '*ā*' is the particle of negation. The medieval grammarians have strongly put forth the view that wherever the negative sense exists, there '*ā*' must be invariably present. They used to say that *ā* is understood (puṇarntu keṭṭatu) in all the finite verbs *vāḷēṉ*, *vāḷēm*, *vāḷōm*, *vāḷīr*, etc., where the appearance of '*ā*' is beynd our imagination. In spite of this incongruity, to hold that the direct addition of the signs of persons to the

verbal themes contribute to the expression of the idea o negation is natural and reasonable.

The negative forms of *the second class of verbs* through all persons are as follows :—

(a) *Negative verbs of the First person singular and plural*:

	Singular	Plural
1.	*nāṭēṉ*	*nāṭēm or nāṭōm*
2.	*urukēṉ*	*urukēm or urukōm*
3.	*varuntēṉ*	*varuntēm or varuntōm*

(b) *Negative verbs of the second person singular and plural*:

	Singular	Plural
1.	*nāṭāy*	*nāṭīr*
2.	*urukāy*	*urukīr*
3.	*varuntāy*	*varuntīr*

(c) *Negative verbs of the third person*:

	Masculine	Feminine	Epicene plural
1.	*nāṭāṉ*	*nāṭāḷ*	*nāṭār*
2.	*urukāṉ*	*urukāḷ*	*urukār*
3.	*varuntāṉ*	*varuntāḷ*	*varuntār*

Neuter Singular	Neuter Plural
nāṭātu	*nāṭā*
urukātu	*urukā*
varuntātu	*varuntā*

The difference between the formation of the first class of verbs and that of the second class to express the negative sense lies in this that in the former the signs of personality are added in most instances to the doubled consonants or to the intervocalic letters which closely come to the verbal roots as explained at p. 110; whereas in the latter they are added directly to the verbal roots, when the final u naturally disappears. This insignificant difference does not contradict the above view that the direct combination of the personal signs with the verbal themes is the means whereby the idea of negation is expressed. The credit of explaining the rationale of the above combination which tends to the expression of the idea of negation in the following words goes to Dr. Caldwell: His explanation is that "The absence of signs of tense appears to contribute to the expression of the idea of negation: it may at least be said that it precludes the signification of the affirmative. In consequence of the absence of tense-sings, the idea expressed by the verb is abstracted from the realities of the past, the present and the future: it leaves the region of actual event, and passes into that of abstractions. Hence this abstract form of the verb may be supposed to have become a negative mood, not by a positive, but by a negative process, by the absence of a predicate of time, not by the aid of a negative particle".[3]

The nagative relative participle (எதிர்காலப் பெயரெச்சம்)

The negative relative participle has taken its origin from the negative finite verbs of the third person. As soon as the final letters, *ṉ*, *ḷ*, *r* and *tu* signifying the masculine and feminine genders, the epicene plural and the neuter singular are eliminated, in the negative final verbs *vāḻāṉ*, *vāḻāḷ*, *vāḻār* and *vāḻātu*, the remaining *vāḻā* becomes the example of the negative relative participle. It should be remembered here that there is nothing to be eliminated in *vāḻā*, the negative verb of

3. A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, p, 469.

neuter plural; for no sooner '*ā*' is eliminated than the remaining portion *vāḷ* loses also the significance of the idea of negation. Therefore *ā* is to be retained. Whether *vāḷā* is a negative relative participle or a negative finite verb of the neuter plural should be realised by means of its significance. The following examples will show that in the days of Tolkāppiyam and the Sangam classics, the negative relative participle has the ending in 'ā' alone and thereby justify the above statement that the negative relative participle is formed by eliminating the final letters of the negative finite verbs of the third person. Examples are :—

'*vārāk* kālam'	(Tol. 723)
'*o<u>n</u><u>r</u>āt* tamar'	(do 986)
'*tiriyā* māṭci'	(do 990)
'*vāṭā* vaḷḷi'	(do 1005)
'*ku<u>r</u>iyā* i<u>n</u>pam'	(Akam. 2)
'*tavirā* īkai'	(Puram. 3)

The relative participle wil qualify, by rule, only the nouns of the third person. The use of the negative relative participle in relation to the first and second persons like *vārāta ye<u>n</u><u>n</u>ai* and *vārāta u<u>n</u><u>n</u>ai* is of a later development and also unidiomatic. The ancient idiomatic use seems to have been *vārē<u>n</u>ai* and *vārāyai.* Therefore the view that the negative relative participle has taken its origin only from the negative verbs of the third person and that its final ā is only a remnant of the suffixes of the third person is justifiable.

From the days of Tirukkuṟaḷ, the negative relative participle has taken a different form from that quoted above.

'*akalāta kālai*'	(Kural. 1226)
'*tūkkāta oppuravu*'	(do. 480)

'*kaḷaiyāta tuṉpam*'
'*vaḷaiyāta ceṅkōl*' } (Cilampu. XXI)

'*puṇarāta col*' (Iṟaiyaṉār. 15)

On the analogy of the affirmative relative participle *ceyta* where *ta* exists in the end, the negative relative participle also has taken its forms like *akalāta*, *tūkkāta*, etc. *ta* in the negative merely appears to correspond to its affirmative. Nowhere do we find in Tolkāppiyam and in the Sangam classics, the form of the negative relative participle with '*a*' in the end. When the conception that relative participles, whether it is affirmative or negative, should invariably end in *a* arose, the original forms *vārāk kālam*, *vātā vaḷḷi* etc., are wrongly considered by the grammarians as negative relative participle losing its end *a* (ஈறுகெட்ட எதிர்மறைப் பெயரெச்சம்). In my opinion, the later forms *akalāta*, *tūkkāta*, etc. should be really designated as negative relative participles having *a* ending (ஈறு நீண்ட எதிர்மறைப் பெயரெச்சம்).

Various negative forms:

ceyyā the combination of the verbal theme with a detached portion of the suffixes of the third person is supposed to have been the bases for the origin of the various negative forms. The negative verbal participle is formed from that base.

'*eñcātu kiḷanta*' (Tol. 1059)

'*varaiyātu pirital*' (do. 1086)

On the analogy of the affirmative verbal participle *ceytu* where *tu* exists in the end, the negative verbal participle also has taken its forms like *eñcātu* and *varaiyātu*. In *ceytu*, '*t*' denotes the preterite tense whereas in *eñcātu t* exists only to correspond to the affirmative.

The negative abstract nouns and the negative verbal nouns also have originated from the same source, *ceyyā*. Negative abstract nouns are *vekuḷāmai*, *poyyāmai*, etc. and negative verbal nouns are *ceyyāmai*, *kūṟāmai*. etc.

Ceyyāti and ceyyātim

The assertive statement of Dr. Caldwell that the Dravidian imperatives are in general nothing but verbal nouns, pronounced emphatically and hence, the Tamil *ceyyādi* do not thou, is simply *ceyyādu* doing not, with the addition of the emphatic *ē* seems to be incorrect.[4] For *ceyyādē* is a corruption of *ceyyāti*, where *ī* the auxiliary verb combines with the verbal participle to make the sense of the negative imperative. Reference has been made to the peculiar function of '*ī*' in the Chapter on '*ī*' - a taṉviṉai verb. *maṟavātīmē* (473) and '*cellātīmō*' (186) of Aiṅkuṟunūṟu are the instances where *ī* with the sign of plurality has combined with the negative verbal participle to express the idea of the prohibitive imperative of the plural.

vēṇṭā and vēṇṭām (வேண்டா, வேண்டாம்)

That *vēṇṭu* 'to desire or to beg' is the verbal root is clear from the constant occurrence of the line *aṉṉāy vāḻi vēṇṭu*' in the Sangam classics. *vēṇṭā* the negative is the predicate of both the singular and plural of the neuter. Examples are:

'*oṉṟum vēṇṭā kāppiṉ uḷḷē*' (Tol 1160)
'*maḻittalum nīṭṭalum vēṇṭā*' (Kural. 280)

Nowadays *vēṇṭām* is very much used in place of *vēṇṭā*. The addition of *ām* or *ākum* in the end of the affirmative or the negative verbs is to be found in Tirukkural in a number of

4. A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, p. 472.

places '*paṉiyum-am*' (976), '*aṉiyum-am*' (978), '*uḷat ākum*, (235) '*ākā vām*' (376) etc.

vēṇṭām seems to be a corruption of *vēṇṭā+ām*. This will be evident from the Kural,

'*maruntene vēṇṭā-v-ām yākkaikku*' (942)

It is wrong to split it into *vēṇṭu + ām*, as it will express only affirmative sense. At present *vēṇṭām* is a finite verb common to all persons.

il and al, the isolated particles of negation (இல், அல்)

The use of *il* in verbal combinations is very much different from that of *ā* the detached portion of the suffixes of the third person. It can be prefixed to a noun like *ilporuḷ* or to be used after the tense-signs like *uṇṭilaṉ* or to be used as a finite verb like *varutal il*. '*il*' has taken the negative relative participle form *illā* corresponding to *vārā*, *collā* etc., in the days of Tolkāppiyar as is evident from the suttiram,

'*illeṉ kiḷavi ...... ākāram varutalum*' (Tol. 372)

From the days of Tirukkural, the form *illāta* is to be found.

'*illāta col*' (Kural. 198) '*illātā kaṇ*' (Kural. 574). Here the addition of *ā* and *ta* to '*il*' does not change its meaning in any respect. There is no difference in meaning between the ancient form *ilporuḷ* and the later forms *illāp poruḷ* and *illāta poruḷ*. '*il*' has changed into *illātā* for the sole reason to be similar with the forms of the negative relative participle of 'terinilai-vinai' like *naṭavāta*, *kallāta*, etc.

The aforesaid explanation holds good in regard to '*al*' too. Though Tolkāppiyar has not given any rule regarding '*al*, as he has done in the case of '*il*' his use of '*alvaḻi* and '*karumam*

allāc cārpu' (567) leads us to suppose that '*al*' also takes the same changes as those of '*il*'.

The existence of three negative tenses in Tamil like Malayalam:

Like Malayalam, Tamil also has three negative tenses – the past, the present and the future. The past and present negatives are effected by inserting the negative particle *il* (இல்) between the tense-signs and the personal terminations, e. g. *uṇṭilaṉ* and *uṇṇaniṉṟilan*. The future negative tense is expressed by inserting the negative particle *il* between the verbal nouns and the personal signs, e. g. *uṇkilaṉ* and *vālkilaṉ*. The difference in significance between these three negative tenses and *uṇṇāṉ* where '*āṉ*' is directly added to the verbal root is remarkable. In the instances, *uṇṭilaṉ*, *uṇṇāniṉṟilaṉ*, and *uṇkilaṉ*, '*il*' the negative particle gives negation, not to the action denoted by the verbal theme '*uṇ*'; but it negatives only the meanings denoted by the tense-signs. *uṇṭilaṉ* means that he has not done the eating in the past, suggesting that he may do it at present or in future. *uṇṇāniṉṟilaṉ* means that he is not eating at present, but he may do so in future. *uṇkilaṉ* means that he will not eat in the near future, but his eating in the future is not ruled out. As '*il*' the negative particle is attached to the past and present tense signs in the examples *uṇṭilaṉ* aad *uṇṇāniṉṟilaṉ*, and to the verbal noun in uṇkilaṉ, it gives negation only to the idea expressed by tense infixes and the verbal noun, not to the action denoted by the verbal root. But in the instance *uṇṇāṉ*, the direct combination of the signs of person with the verbal root gives negation to the action itself, with reference to no time. From the above explanation, it will be clear that there are four kinds of negative verbs in Tamil - *uṇṭilaṉ, uṇṇāniṉṟilan, uṇkilaṉ* and *uṇṇāṉ*. Therefore the statement of Dr. Caldwell that Tamil

negative is destitute of the signs of present, past and future time is not acceptable.[5]

The position of the tense infix in the negative verb:

In this connection it is worthwhile to mention why '*t*' (த்) lost its meaning of past tense in the instances *ceyyāta* and *ceyyātu* of the negative relative and verbal participles. In the examples *uṇṭilaṉ* and *uṇṇāniṉṟilaṉ* the tense infixes (*t* and *āniṉṟu*) have not been deprived of their significance because they are placed closely to the verbal root and before the particle of negation. But in *ceyyāta* and *ceyyātu*, '*t*' is placed after the detached particle *ā* the sign of negation. There is nothing left to signify by '*t*' when *ā* standing before it already negatives the action expressed by the verbal theme. *ceyyāta* and *ceyyātu* are formed on the analogy of the affirmative forms *ceyta* and *ceytu*. From this we may infer that placing a tense infix after the negative element is the way to deprive it of its significance. There is also another example to substantiate it.

'*pāṭil maṉṉaraip pāṭılmār emarē*' (Puram. 375)

m (ம்) is a sign of present tense in the ancient days as is evident from *ceyyum*, *eṉṉaṉār* and *koṇmār*. In the expression 'pāṭalmār' of Puram 375, '*m*' has lost its function because it has placed behind the isolated particle of '*al*'. Thus the position of tense-infix in the negative verbs is the cause for its significance or non-significance. If it is placed before the element of negation, it denotes tense. If it is placed after it, it loses its capacity.

The suffixes of aṉ and āṉ etc.

In the negative verbs, the euphonic particles *cāriyai* are out of place. The difference between the personal signs

5. Ibid., p. 469.

beginning with short vowel like *aṉ aḷ*, *ar*, *atu* and *a* and those beginning with long one *āṉ*, *āḷ*, *ār ātu* and *ā*, so far as their use in the negation is concerned, lies in this that while the former are added to the isolated negative particle *il* or *al* like *uṇṭilaṉ* and *uṇṇalaṉ* the latter are annexed directly to the verbal roots like *uṇṇāṉ*, *uṇṇāḷ* etc. Because of this difference in use, the existence of the suffixes of the third person as two different sets is justifiable. It is to be remembered that the suffixes of the third person whether short or long are nothing but the corrupted forms of the demonstrative pronouns.

From the foregoing investigation, it is manifest that the direct combination of the signs of personality with the verbal roots tends to the expression of the idea of negation and that the long vowel '*ā*' which is mentioned as a sign of negation by the Tamil grammarians is nothing but the detached portion of the suffixes of the third person. By this reason, I find myself in disagreement with the statement of Dr. Caldwell that the short vowel '*a*' is the negative particle and that it is to be found in the invariable length of the initial vowel of the pronominal terminations.[6]

6. Ibid, p. 469.

14. THE PRESENT TENSE - INFIXES OF THE SANGAM PERIOD

This chapter will deal with the question how the ancient Tamils expressed the idea of the present tense, through all persons, before the introduction of *āniṉṟu*, *kiṉṟu* and *kiṟu* which arose probably after the Sangam period. In Paripādal, one of the Eight collections, *cērkiṉṟa* is used for the first time. Therefore one may argue that *kiṉṟu* is used even in the days of the Sangam classics. But in all probability, it should be remembered that on etymological grounds and on the side of the matter, Paripādal cannot be ragarded as contemporaneous with the other works of the Eight collections. I am inclined to hold that most of the authors of Paripādal are not anterior to the author of Tirukkuṟal. They may be contemporaneous with or posterior to him. As the compilation of the Sangam classics might have taken place only after the collapse of the Third Sangam, it is reasonable to hold that the poems of the authors who immediately followed the Sangam period might also have been included in the Collections. Above all, the poem (22) of Paripādal in which *cērkiṉṟa* is found is by an anonymous author. Therefore we cannot decide whether this poem in question is contemporaneous with other poems of Paripādal or it belongs to a later period. As it is a decided fact that among the three present tense-infixes of the later days āniṉṟu took its birth prior to kiṉṟu, it is reasonable to suggest that the poem of Paripādal in which cērkiṉṟa is found, must certainly be posterior to Tirukkuṟaḷ in which we come

across the use of *āniṉṟu* in '*iravāniṉṟa*' (1157). For these reasons, the view that *kiṉṟu* was used even in the days of the Sangam Classics is not acceptable.

1. '*um*' (உம்)

The point that *ceyyum* had expressed only the present and that it was used as a finite verb in relation to the masculine and feminine genders and the singular and plural of the neuter in the days of Tolkāppiyar is evident from the suttiram,

> "*pallōr paṭarkkai muṉṉilai taṉmai*
> *avvayiṉ mūṉṟum nikaḻum kālattuc*
> *ceyyum eṉṉum kiḷaviyoṭu koḷḷā*" (Tol. 711)

This rule seems to have persisted even in the Sangam period. Thus *avaṉ ceyyum* 'he does', *avaḷ ceyyum* 'she does', *atu ceyyum* 'it does' and *avai ceyyum* 'they (neuter) do' were in practice in those days to denote the present tense. We are at a loss to know how the present tense was brought out in other cases, i.e., in the places of the first and second persons and the epicene plural. The commentators of Tolkāppiyam have shown the following expressions as examples under many suttirams of Tolkāppiyam :—

1. *nāṉ uṇṇāniṉṟēṉ* or *nāṉ uṇkiṉṟēṉ*
2. *nām uṇṇāniṉṟēm* or *nām uṇkiṉṟēm*
3. *nī uṇṇāniṉṟāy* or *nī uṇkiṉṟāy*
4. *nīr uṇṇāniṉṟīr* or *nīr uṇkiṉṟīr*
5. *avar uṇṇāniṉṟār* or *avar uṇkiṉṟār*

They have done great mistake in showing verbs of later origin as examples to the rules of Tolkāppiyam. They have done so because they were unaware that āniṉṟu and kiṉṟu took their birth only after the period of the Sangam Classics. I have

here attempted to show the verbs of the persent tense used in the first and second persons and epicene plural before and during the period of the Sangam Classics.

2. '*tum*' (தும்)

In the days of the Sangam literature, *tum* is used to denote the present tense of the first person plural. Instances are :

'*yām nāṭṭiṭaṉ nāṭṭiṭaṉ varutum*' (Puram. 152)
'*yām avaṉiṉṟum varutum*' (Siru. 143)
'*nāmilam ākutal aṟitum*' (Naṟ. 299)

Now we are accustomed to use *varkukiṟēm* or *varukiṟōm*, in place of *varutum* 'we come'.

3. '*al*' (அல்)

al is used to denote the present tense of the first person singular in the Sangam classics.

'*āṭumali uvakaiyoṭu varuval*' (Puram. 165)
'*niṟ kaṇṭaṉeṉ varuval*' (do. 23)

Though the commentator of Puṟanāṉūru has interpreted the expression *varuval* in the past I hold it to be in the present. The context will bear evidence to my view. Nowdays we frequently use *varukiṟēṉ* in place of *varuval* 'I come'.

As *tum* has denoted the present tense of the first person plural, we have reason to suppose that *tu* (து) might have been existed to indicate the present tense of the first person singular. Though we do not come across any instance to confirm this supposition, the mention of *tu* as one of the

suffixes of the first person singluar by Tolkāppiyar at least shows that the above view is not wrong.

4. '*ti*' (தி)

ti is used to denote the present tense of the second person singular in the ancient period. The poems 8 and 10 of Puṟanāṉūṟu are illustrative of this point. *varaiti, oḷitti, iṟatti, varuti* and *viḷaṅkuti* in the eighth stanza and *oṟutti* and *taṇiti* in the tenth are the verbs of the present tense in the second person singular. Now we are using *varukiṟay* in place of *varuti* 'you come'.

5. '*tir*' (திர்)

'*kāṉam kaṭattir eṉakkēṭpiṉ*' (Kali. 7)

'*tāyar nīr pōltir*' (do. 9)

These instances indicate the present tense of the second person plural. We are now using *kaṭakkiṟīr* and *pōlkiṟīr* in place of *kaṭattir* 'you cross'; and *pōltir* 'you appear'

6. *utu - the present tense-infix*

From the instances shown above, it is to be explained how *tum, ti* and *tir* denote the present tense; for '*t*' (த்) is generally regarded as the infix of the past tense. Dr. Caldwell admits of the use of *utu* the intermediate demonstrative pronoun as the present tense particle in Canarese.[1] As it is generally accepted by the Dravidian philologists that *atu* the remote demonstrative pronoun was used to serve the purpose of denoting past tense, it is not wrong to hold that *utu* the intermediate demonstrative pronoun was also used as a particle to denote the present tense. Just as *a* the initial vowel in *atu* is elided in most instances like *naṭantatu. vantatu*, etc., so

1. A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, p. 490.

also *u* the initial vowel in *utu* is understood in many places like *varaiti, oḷitti,* etc. Yet in some instances like *viḷaṅkuti* and *varuti, utu* the present tense particle survives in full. The disappearance of the initial vowels '*a*' and '*u*' leads us to confusion in certain contexts whether the remaining '*t*' is a part of *atu* the past and *utu* the present. In any way *t* (த்) will never denote the future Therefore the view of Pavaṇantiyār that '*t*' will express both the past and the future ('tavvoṭu iṟappum etirvum' S. 145) is unjustifiable. What is justifiable is that *t* (த்) when deprived of its initial vowels takes a common stand to denote the past and the present. It is also to be remembered that the commentators of the ancient classics have wrongly interpreted many finite verbs, as if they were in the future, in spite of the fact that they donote the present. Before the advent of *āniṉṟu, kiṉṟu* and *kiṟu*, it seems that *utu* had a predominate usage as a present tense-infix. It is wrong to suppose that '*t*' the ordinary sign of the past tense came to be employed, in addition, to denote the present. For '*t*' when it denotes the present, should be regarded as the remnant of *utu* the present tense-infix. Therefore the opinion of Dr. Caldwell that 'the use of the ordinary sign of the preterite in all the dialects, was not originally restricted to that tense so absolutely as it is now'[2] is objectionable.

7. *The present tense of the epicene plural*:

'*eṉmaṉār*' is the common occurrence in the text of Tolkāppiyam. Though the commentators differ from one another in respect of splitting the expression '*eṉmaṉār*' they agree that it denotes the future. To quote the different manners in which they split and explain this word is out of place here. '*eṉmaṉār*' eṉm+aṉ+ār is a combination of a relative participle and a noun which it qualifies. '*eṉṉum*' is shortened into 'eṉm'

2. Ibid; 491.

in accordance with the rule (722) of Tolkāppiyam like pōlum>pōnm. It is a relative participle of '*ceyyum*' formula, denoting the present. The final portion '*ār*', in '*eṉmaṉār*' is the corruption of '*avar*' the remote demonstrative pronoun. 'aṉ' in the middle is an euphonic particle. Thus the expression '*eṉmaṉār pulavar*' means 'the learned men say'. It is wrong to attirbute to it the sense of future, as it leads to the mistaken notion that the contemporaries of Tolkāppiyar had not said so. '*eṉmar*' enm+ar too is synonmous with '*eṉmaṉār*'. A considerable number of instances like *kāṇmār*, *puṇarmār*, *koṇmār*, *muṭimār*, *piṇimār*, *uṇmār* to be found profusely in the Sangam classics bear evidence to the combination of the relative participle of the present with the suffix of the epicene plural.

From the above explanation, it is clear that the intermediate demonstrative pronoun '*utu*' (உது) was used to express the present in the verbs of the first and second persons and that '*um*' (உம்) was used to denote the present in the third person.

15. CONCLUSION

In the foregoing pages, I have dealt with the various aspects of the Tamil verbs. The true verbal forms, the loss of old verbal roots and the rise of new ones, together with the changes of meanings and the changes of forms have been dealt with elaborately. As a result of my research, I have emphasized that the inherent nature of the verbs is to possess the capacity to express time and that the future is always implicit in the root itself.

I have shown, after an elaborate and careful analysis, that *pi* and *vi*, mentioned as particles of piṟaviṉai by the Tamil grammarians, are the combinations of the *p* and *v*, the remnant parts of the verbal nouns with '*i*' an auxiliary verb. I have also shown that *ā*, the so called negative element is nothing but the detached portion of the suffixes of the third person. I have put forth the view that the sense of piṟavinai, the concept of the future and the idea of negation in the finite verbs are effected by the different kinds of formations existing in Tamil, not by any external element.

I have attempted to show how the ancient Tamil people expressed the present tense, through all persons, when *āniṉṟu* and *kiṉṟ*u and *kiṟu* had not taken their birth. It will be easily understood from the illustrations taken from Tolkāppiyam and the ancient Sangam classics, how they are chiefly helpful

in determining the antiquity and growth of the Tamil language. In various parts of this thesis I have clearly shown how Tirukkuṟal has taken its birth only after the Sangam classics.

As a result of my research, I have given new interpretations and new explanations to the suittirams 512, 553, 682, 897, 932, 933 and 934 of Tolkāppiyam, as against the interpretations given by certain commentators.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arāsan̲ Caṇmukan̲ār :	*Pāyira virutti*
Āṟumuka Nāvalar :	*Nan̲n̲ūl urai*
Beschi :	*Kodum Tamil*
Breal, Prof :	*Semantics*
Caldwell, Dr :	*A comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages*
Caṅkara Namaccivāyar :	*Nan̲n̲ūl urai*
Cēn̲āvaraiyar :	*Tolkāppiyam collatikāra urai*
Iḷampūraṇar :	*Tolkāppiya urai*
Jesperson, otto :	*Language-its Nature, Development and Origin*
Kumarasamy Pulavar, A. :	*Vin̲aip pakupata viḷakkam*
Manickam, Dr. V. Sp. :	*Tolkāppiyap putumai*
Mailainātar :	*Nan̲n̲ūl urai*
Naccinārkkin̲iyar :	*Tolkāppiya urai*
Parimēlaḻakar :	*Tirukkuṟaḷ urai*
Paul :	*Principles of the History of Language*
Pavaṇantiyār :	*Nan̲n̲ūl*
Pērāciriyar :	*Tolkāppiya urai*

Sastri, P. S. S. :	*History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil*
Sivagnana Munivar :	*Nannūl Viruttiyurai; Sūttira virutti*
Srinivasa Aiyangar, M. :	*Tamil Studies*
Subramaniya Dikshitar :	*Pirayōka Vivēkam*
Swaminatha Decikar:	*Ilakkaṇakkottu*
Teyvaccilaiyār :	*Tolkāppiya urai*
Tirunāvukkarasar :	*Tēvāram*
Tiruttakkatēvar :	*Cīvaka Cintāmaṇi*
Tolkāppiyar :	*Tolkāppiyam*
Tucker, T. G., :	*Introduction to the Natural History of Language*
Vendryes :	*Language*
Winslow, Miron, Rev. :	*Comprehensive Tamil and English Dictionary*
Whitney :	*Language and the Study of Language*

INDEX

References are to pages

A

A Comparative grammar of the Dravidian Languages: 14, 31, 34, 36, 41, 42, 47, 83, 86, 95, 107, 114, 117, 120, 121, 125, 126
acaiccol, 90
affirmative, 33, 36, 37, 55, 56, 60, 61, 62, 98, 99, 100, 106, 110, 114, 116- 118, 120
ahṟiṇai, 5, 81
Akanāṉūṟu, 20, 31, 32, 39, 46, 51, 54, 55, 59, 61, 71, 72, 73, 108, 115
alvaḷi, 81, 118
Arasaṉ Caṇmukaṉār, 6, 13
auxiliaries, 16, 17, 18, 44
  affixes, 34
Āṟumuka Nāvalar, 12, 26, 49

B

Beschi, 111
Breal, Prof., 21, 62

C

Caldwell, Dr., 10, 14, 23, 31, 34, 36, 41, 42, 47, 83, 86, 87, 88, 95, 107, 108, 114, 117, 119, 121, 125, 126
Cambodians, 21,
Canarese, 107, 108, 125
case, 5, 78, 111
  sign, 7, 56, 58, 59, 79, 96
  accusative, 11, 58, 77, 78, 79, 80
  dative, 21, 80, 107
  eḷuvāy, 96
  genitive, 111
  instrumental, 107
  locative, 21
  nominative, 11, 78, 79, 80, 96
  vēṟṟumai, 7, 11, 81, 96
causal, 37, 86, 87,
  particle, 83, 86, 87
Cellūrkkōcikaṉ Kaṇṇaṉār, 54
Cilappatikāram, 29, 31, 34, 38 39, 53, 54, 57, 67, 73, 75, 116
Ciṟupāṇāṟṟuppaṭai, 59, 124
Civaka Cintāmaṇi, 59, 62
Cēnāvaraiyar, 6, 35, 60, 97, 98
Comprehensive Tamil and English Dictionary, 55
conjunctive particle, 90
conjugation, 6, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 30, 40, 41, 45, 46, 60
consonants, 18, 24, 25, 27, 28 29, 30, 31, 36, 42, 43, 44, 46, 88, 90, 91, 106, 110
  doubled, 114
  final, 34
  initial, 26, 106
  reduplication of 27, 110

reduplication of the final, 52
cāriyai, 120

D

derivative forms, 12
dissyllabic, 13, 14, 25
dhātu, 3, 4

E

Eight collections : 54, 72, 122
eḷuttuppēṟu, 90
English, 77
equivalents 50
enunciative u, 31
epicene plural, 85, 105, 106, 110, 111, 113, 114, 123, 124, 126, 127
Eṭṭuttokai, 72
euphony, 27, 104, 110
reduplication of. 60
expletives 44, 56, 63, 90, 100, 101
ēval 100

F

figurative term, 16
formative, 13, 31, 36

G

gender 7
feminine 107, 108, 110, 111, 113, 114, 123
masculine 103, 105, 106, 108, 110, 111, 113, 114, 123
neuter 86, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 110, 111, 113, 114, 115, 117, 123
Gundert, Dr., 41, 111

H

hiatus 106, 110
History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil 4

I

Ilakkaṇakkottu 4, 36, 82, 97
Iḷampūraṇar 6
implication 11,
infix 85, 94, 101, 119, 120, 122, 125, 126
interjection 44
interrogative 59, 111
Introduction to the Natural History of Language, 43, 66, 69, 72
Iṟaiyaṉār Kaḷaviyal, 116
iṟantatu taḻīiya yecca ummai, 91
irrational beeings 19
intervocalic letters 106, 110, 114
īreḻuttu orumoḻi 13, 14,

J

Jesperson Otto 50

K

Kalittokai 32, 135
Kallāṭar 54
Kamparāmāyaṇam, 75
Kapilar 54
Kaṭiyalūr uruttiraṉ kaṇṇaṉār, 67
kālam, 6, 7, 11, 92, 94, 96, 102, 123
Kārikai, 25
Kodum Tamil, 111
Kumarasamy Pulavar, A., 17
Kuṟiñcippāṭṭu, 61

kuṟṟiyalukaram, 34
mentoṭar - 82
neṭiṟṟoṭar, 34, 82
uyirttoṭar, 82
Kuṟuntokai, 8, 44

L

Language, 3, 50
Language and the study of Language, 68

M

Mailaināṭar, 23, 24
Malaipaṭukaṭāam, 57
Malayalam, 119
Manickam, Dr. V. Sp., 5
Maṇimēkalai, 39, 53, 54, 60, 73, 75
marūu 49
Maturaikkāñci, 57
Māmūlaṉār, 54
metaphor, 19
monosyllabic, 13, 14, 25, 52
Mullaippāṭṭu, 76
muṉṉilai, 18, 45, 89, 90, 91, 97, 100, 107, 123

N

Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, 7, 36, 60, 61, 99
Nakkīrar, 54
Naṉṉūl, 3, 7, 13, 23, 24, 29, 36, 46, 49, 52, 64, 87, 90, 91, 94, 97, 99, 106
Naṟṟiṇai, 124
nasals, 82
negative, 10, 11, 25, 33, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45, 56, 60- 62, 85, 99, 106, 109-121, 128
Nēmināṭam, 4, 64
non-human sounds, 68
nominal, 3, 4, 12
forms 49
roots 10
noun : 1-6, 9-15, 20, 23, 28, 32, 44, 56, 59, 70, 96, 104, 115, 118, 126
abstract, 55, 117
defective, 55
participial, 59, 107
particle of, 106
numerical connective, 91

O

onomatopoetic, 66, 68
optative, 44, 93

P

pakuti, 23, 24
paradigm, 91, 101, 102
Paraṇar, 54
Parimēlaḻakar, 36, 61, 92
Paripāṭal, 43, 68, 122
participle, 52
relative, 25, 54, 85, 101, 102, 105, 114–116, 118 120, 126, 127
verbal, 13, 17, 18, 25, 33, 36, 51, 53, 59, 84, 89-91, 106, 107, 116, 117, 120
particle, 7, 9, 82, 85, 88, 94 100, 101, 104–106, 108, 111, 112, 114, 118-121, 125, 126, 128
euphonic, 94, 120, 127
of comparison, 54
parts of speech 1, 2, 7, 11
Patiṟṟuppattu, 51, 55
Pattuppāṭṭu, 73
Pāyira Virutti 6, 13
Paul, 12, 69
Pavaṇantiyār, 6, 23, 32, 36, 47, 48, 53, 90, 126

Perumpāṇā ṟṟuppaṭai, 74
Peruṅkatai, 53, 54, 60, 62, 68, 73
personal sign, 7, 85, 94, 95, 120
first person, 21, 33, 103, 105, 109-111, 113, 123-125, 127
second person, 16, 18, 21, 22, 43, 58, 63, 87, 90, 91, 96-103, 109, 111, 113, 115, 123-125, 127
third person 21, 103, 105-108, 110 116, 118, 121, 127, 128
peyar, 1, 2, 4, 6, 20, 96
eñcu kiḷavi 61
nilaik kiḷavi 11
Pērāciriyar, 49, 54
pirakrti 23, 24
Pirayōka vivēkam, 3, 4, 97
plural, 16, 41, 43, 103- 106, 108-110, 111, 113-115, 117, 123-125
pluralisation, 85
positive, 10, 11, 114
predicate 89, 114, 117
prefix 14-16, 118
Principles of the History of Language, 12
pronominal termination, 94, 121
pronoun, 21
demonstrative, 121
intermediate d. 125, 127
remote d. 125, 127
Puṟanāṉū ṟu, 8, 31, 38, 55, 59, 61, 74-76, 108, 115, 120, 124, 125
Puṟapporuḷ Veṇpāmālai, 67
puṭai peyarcci 3

R

rational beings, 19,
roots : 4, 5, 9-14, 16, 23-26, 29, 32, 33, 35, 37, 41, 42, 44, 46, 51-53, 55, 57, 59, 68 69, 82, 88, 89, 91, 97, 100, 128

S

Sangam classics, 16, 37, 51-55, 58, 61, 62, 72, 74, 75, 99- 101, 107, 108, 115- 117, 122- 124, 127- 129
period, 26, 53, 73, 108, 122, 123
Sanskrit, 3, 4, 23, 50, 51, 60,64, 65, 87
Grammarians, 4
Sastri, P. S. S., 3, 4
Semantics, 21, 62
short u, 24
shortened u, 14, 34, 103, 106,
shortened i, 18
singular, 16, 18, 22, 36, 41-43, 58, 87, 90, 96-103, 105, 107-111, 113, 114, 117, 123- 125,
Sivagnana Munivar, 3, 12, 13, 23, 97, 98
slang, 69
Srinivasa Aiyangar, M., 4
subjunctive, 40, 41, 45
Subramaniya Dikshitar, 3, 97
suffix, 23, 24, 33, 84, 85, 88, 94, 95, 97- 101, 104-108, 111, 112, 115, 116,118, 120, 121, 125, 127, 128,
of agency 12, 13
pronominal 7
terminal 95
Sūttiravirutti, 3
Swaminata Decikar, 36, 82, 97
synonym, 3, 8, 21, 31, 38, 62, 73, 74

T

Tamil, 1-5, 10-14, 19, 20, 33-37, 41, 42, 44, 46, 49-52, 57, 58, 61, 64, 65, 69, 70, 72-74, 77, 78, 82, 84-87, 90-93, 96, 98, 101, 102, 104, 107, 108, 111. 112, 117, 119, 121, 122, 128, 129,
  Puritans, 51
Tamil Polil, 5
Tamil Studies, 4
tanmai, 45, 123
Telugu, 83
Ten Idyls, 54, 72
tense, 40, 52, 89, 92, 93, 95 97, 101, 102, 114, 119, 120
  infix 7, 94
  sign 7, 93, 94, 112, 114, 118, 119
  iṟanta kālam 94
  future t., 40, 41, 43, 45, 85, 95, 97, 101, 103-105, 107-110, 112
  past t., 40, 45, 52, 102, 105, 120, 125, 126
  present t., 40, 41, 43, 45, 85, 95, 102, 105, 107, 108, 112, 120, 122-126, 128
  preterite, 41-43, 47, 52, 53, 59, 126
  p. sign, 7
  p. tense, 18, 25, 27, 28, 32, 59, 89, 94, 95, 116
Teyvaccilaiyār, 3, 4, 78
Tirukkōvai, 76
Tirukkuṟaḷ, 4, 8, 20, 33, 36, 38, 39, 44, 47, 53, 54, 56, 58, 61, 63, 73-76, 84, 92, 108, 115, 117, 118, 122, 129
Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai, 30
Tirunāvukkarasar, 85
Tiruttakkatēvar, 55, 61
Tolkāppiyam, 3-5, 7, 8, 12 18-20, 32, 35-39, 41, 42, 44-50, 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60-62, 64, 67, 69, 70, 72, 73, 76, 78, 79, 89-92, 94-97, 99-103, 107, 111, 112, 115-118, 123, 126-129
  Eluttatikāram, 3
    kuṟṟiyalukarap-puṇariyal 103
    uyirmayaṅkiyal, 103
  Collatikāram, 3, 8, 97
    viṉaiyiyal, 8, 99
    iṭaiyiyal, 90
    uriyiyal, 5, 37, 60
    eccaviyal, 90, 99
  Poruḷatikāram, 8
    ceyyuḷiyal, 8
Tolkāppiyar, 2, 4, 7, 10, 13, 14, 18-21, 23, 28, 31, 38, 44-49, 53, 57, 61-63, 66, 68, 69, 76, 78, 82, 89, 92-94, 97-102, 107, 111, 118, 123, 125, 127
Tolkāppiyapputumai, 5
trisyllabic, 13, 14
Tucker, T. G., 43, 66, 69, 72

U

uriccol, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 37, 38, 60, 61
uyartiṇai 5, 81

V

Vaḻakkum Ceyyuḷum, 5
Vendryes, 2
Veṇpāmālai 39
verb :
  alternative, 57
  appellative, 93
  auxiliary, 18, 57, 88, 90, 117, 128
  causative, 24, 77, 88

declarative, 93
extinct, 51
finite, 7, 8, 51-53, 68, 85, 87, 91, 93, 94, 106, 114, 115, 118, 123, 126, 128
infinitive, 40, 41, 45, 88
intransitive, 31, 77, 86, 87
imperative, 6, 16-18, 22, 27, 36, 39, 41-44, 46, 56, 58, 59, 96-103, 117
transitive, 25, 77, 87
verbal, 3, 4, 12, 36, 70, 88, 118
action, 11
affirmative participle, 61
base, 84, 89, 100, 104
form, 1, 3, 6, 35, 44, 49, 52, 128
noun, 8, 16, 24-26, 27, 32-34, 40, 41, 45, 52, 57, 58, 74, 83-85, 87-89, 95, 104, 105, 107-110, 117, 118, 128
root, 3, 4, 7, 10-14, 16-24, 30, 34, 35, 37, 44, 48, 51, 52, 56, 64, 68, 72, 81-84, 88-90, 94-97, 99-101, 105, 106, 109-111, 114, 117, 119-121, 128
stem, 3
theme, 36, 44, 59, 81, 82, 94, 96, 108, 109, 112-114, 116, 119, 120
verbs of commands 90, 101
of request 90
vikāram 24
Villi Pāratam 43
vi<u>n</u>ai, 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 11, 92-94, 96, 100, 102
col, 5, 8, 37, 39, 91, 97
eñcu kiḷavi, 61
kuṟippu, 93,
peyar, 8
tokai, 30, 37, 38, 44, 47, 56, 58, 102, 103
ceyappaṭu poruḷ kuṉṟiya v., 77-79, 81
ceyappaṭu poruḷ kuṉṟā v., 77, 79, 81
ēval v., 87
piṟa v., 30, 31, 39, 67, 75, 77, 81-89, 104, 112, 128
taṉ v., 31, 32, 67, 77, 81-89, 104, 117
terinilai, 92, 93, 118
viyaṅkōḷ, 93
Viṉaippakupata viḷakkam, 17
Vīracōḻiyam, 4, 64, 94
vocabulary, 48, 50, 64, 66, 68, 70
vocalisation, 31,
vowel, 19, 24, 25, 106, 111, 112
consonant, 31, 42
consonantal word, 52, 53
final, 27
initial, 26, 27, 33, 42, 47, 111, 112, 121, 125, 126
long, 28, 32, 46, 47, 111, 112, 121
penultimate, 27
root, 29
short, 29, 32, 42, 46, 52, 111, 121

W

Winslow, Miron Rev., 55
Whitney, 68

ERRATA

Page	*Line*	*Error*	*Correction*
3	24	Dr. P.S. Sastri	Dr. P.S.S. Sastri
6	F. N.	Cammukanar	caṇmukaṉār
12	12	kaṇi	kaṉi
	17	talirii	taḷirii
	17	puii	pūii
	17	kaṇii	kaṉii
18	14	meyūrntu	meyyūrntu
25	26	ankā	aṅkā
	26	annā	aṇṇā
30	19	tiṅkāl	tiṇkāḷ
31	23	An in	As in
38	22	kaṇṇuḷḷir	kaṇṇuḷḷiṉ
56	22	view than	view that
76	7	kaḷi (களி)	kaḷi (கழி)
83	12	tt should	It should
	13	It requires	it requires
91	6	mar pin	marapiṉ
93	1	viṉik kuṟippu	viṉaik kuṟippu
	19	kurippu	kuṟippu
100	5	ceyyaṉ	ceyyeṉ
101	10	Bat	But
102	15	kolkaliru	kolkaḷiṟu
103	9	uyiṟiṟṟup-puṇarial (உயிரீற்றுப் புணரியல்)	uyirmayaṅkiyal (உயிர்மயங்கியல்)
	19	Neutṟal plural	Neuter plural
107	26	nuṉṉilai	muṉṉilai
	28	kollā	koḷḷā
	30	femine	feminine
109	15	ceyyo̱m	ceyyōm
110	8	vāḷāḷ	vāḷāḷ
	21	redoublication	reduplication
119	9	uṇṇaniṉṟilan	uṇṇāniṉṟilaṉ
123	25	whlch	which
124	11	varkukiṟēm	varukiṟēm
127	9	synonmous	synonymous